

# THE EVANGELICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXXIX.

JANUARY, 1859.

## ARTICLE I.

### THE NEW TESTAMENT BISHOP, A TEACHER.

Till I come give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine.—  
1 TIM. 4: 13.

THESE words are, at once, the most comprehensive and critical definition of the duties of a minister of the Gospel. We recognize in them the characteristic difference between a Gospel minister, and a minister of the Law. Here he is a priest, there a preacher. In the former economy the minister stood behind the altar, and through days, and months, and years, and centuries, offered the spotless lambs of the people of God—until the day when God should offer his own lamb; neither prophesying nor preaching, only offering sacrifices. But in the latter economy, the minister stands before the altar, the last typical sacrifice has been offered, and with it, has forever disappeared the priest. Sacrifices are, indeed, still offered; but only as consequences, not as antecedents of forgiveness of sin.

The text clearly sets forth the *didactic* nature of the ministerial office, under the new dispensation. *The minister is to be a teacher.* The very frequent recurrence of this idea in the pastoral epistles, proves that it was both true and important. Writing to Timothy, Paul uses such language as this: I. 4, 11; "These things command and *teach*." (13) "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to *doctrine*." (16) "Take heed unto thyself and unto the *doctrine*." (5: 17) "Let the elders who rule well be counted

worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in *word and doctrine*." (6: 2) "These things *teach* and exhort." Tit. 2: 1. "But speak thou the things which become sound *doctrine*." (15) "These things speak and exhort and rebuke with all authority."

That teaching is the New Testament minister's special work, is evident from the warnings given to Timothy and Titus. Tim. 4: 7. "But refuse profane and old wives' fables"—"doting about questions and strifes of words"—"perverse disputings of men: from such withdraw thyself"—"avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called"—"charge them before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth"—"but shun profane and vain babblings"—"foolish and unlearned questions avoid"—and to Titus he says: "give no heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men."

The Scriptures are urged on Timothy, mainly on the ground of their efficaciousness in the teacher's hand. "They are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," and thus it is that "the man of God is perfectly furnished unto every good work." Having such a magazine of arms and armor and ammunition, Timothy is charged to preach the doctrine, by reproof, rebuke, exhortation and patient teaching; or, to paraphrase the text, these were the Scriptures which, in his calling as a teacher, he should read in the church, expound and enforce.

I will only cite two facts more, to show how prominent and characteristic teaching is of the ministerial office. Among the qualifications of a bishop, mentioned by Paul to Timothy, in his first and second epistles—"aptness to teach," is specially included; for while he enumerates many Christian virtues: such as blamelessness, vigilance, self-restraint, comity, hospitality, integrity, holiness and generosity, forbidding covetousness, irascibility, drunkenness, stubbornness and a controversial spirit; as necessary or desirable for bishops, the same are also enjoined as qualifications of deacons and deacons' wives, and even private Christians; but "aptness to teach" is no Christian grace; many possess it who are not Christians, and many are Christians, who do not possess it. This, therefore, among the marks of a bishop, is a diacritical mark, designating and defining his proper sphere of duty.

If any fact could give additional force to the inference from what has already been adduced, it would be this word of Paul to Timothy, in his second and last letter: "And the things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Here we have the whole question of ordination in a single verse; it is to be applied to believers who are competent to teach, because teaching is *the* work of the ministry. When Christ ordained the twelve to their missionary work, it was "to preach the kingdom." In prosecuting this part of their mission, their miraculous powers were only the symbolical language of their healing mission, and a recommendation of it. Publicity was to be the marked feature of their work, as it had been of their Master's work. When Peter is enjoined to give proof of his love, it is by feeding Christ's sheep, i. e., instructing the church. The final commission to the apostles of the church, was a *teaching commission*. When Paul justified himself to the Ephesian elders, he did it on the ground, that he had declared to them the whole counsel of God, both in his public and in his private teachings; and the chief point of his solicitude, when charging them, was in reference to their teaching. He foresaw, what has been fulfilled a thousand times since, that heresiarchs would arise from the clerical ranks, and pervert men from the truth; and to meet such, and counteract their influence, Paul commends the elders to the efficacious and edifying word of God's grace.

How strongly didactic the Gospel dispensation is, may be further inferred from the fact that even the deacons, such as Philip and Stephen, who possessed the aptitude to teach, became ministers of the word. The same seems to have been true of Presbyters, whose first duty was to rule.

The following are some of the reasons why we believe that teaching is the characteristic work of the New Testament minister: This supposition gives the best explanation of the titles "teacher," and "master," as applied to Christ. He was the fountain-head of the didactic succession. It offers the best explanation of the commissions to the apostles, to proclaim his truth to the ends of the world, as the means of establishing the kingdom of God. In the light of this idea, we can best understand the gift of tongues at Pentecost, and in the succeeding age of the church: that every nation, in its own language, might hear the wonderful works of God. This explains the missionary tours of Paul and Peter, Bar-

nabas and Silas, Philip and Stephen, when they entered houses, schools and synagogues, to fulfil their mission. This thought is the key note of Paul's charge to the elders of Ephesus. It is the central idea of the pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus, accounting for the frequent recurrence to "sound teaching," the equally frequent admonitions against false, foolish and contentious teachings; the peculiar eulogy on the Scriptures, as introduced there; the rite of ordination, the history of Stephen and Philip, and the characteristic marks of a bishop, as one "apt to teach," holding fast "the faithful word," and "the form of sound words," "rightly dividing the word of truth," that he may be able by "sound doctrine," both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. Such is the chief officer of the New Testament; a teacher first, and last, and always and everywhere, and chiefly, if not only.

The subject and nature of the teaching, may be gathered from the terms describing it. It is called "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven," "the Gospel," "the Gospel of Christ." The same is meant when it is said that Philip "preached Christ to the Samaritans," or "Jesus unto the eunuch;" and Paul "showing that Christ was the Son of God," "proving that Jesus was Christ," and "preaching Jesus and the Resurrection," was teaching the same thing. So too, "the preaching of the cross," and "Christ crucified," describe the Christian minister's theme. Sometimes it is spoken of as "the truth," "the words of truth," "the grace of God," "the faith," "the mystery of faith," "the mystery of godliness," "the doctrine which is according to godliness," "the doctrine of God our Savior," "the word," "the faithful word," "wholesome words," "the form of sound words," "sound doctrine," "sound speech." These are some of the terms by which the sphere of "the man of God" is bounded. You will observe here, in the very language describing the minister's office, is involved his duty. If it were known only as "the Gospel," or "the grace of God," proclamation would be enough, and a herald could do the work; but it is called "the word," "the truth," and "the word of truth." It is "sound doctrine," and "the doctrine of God our Savior." It is "wholesome words," as opposed to sickly words. Now truth and words and doctrine are the peculiar province of the teacher. The teacher is a "doctor," his teachings are "doctrines," and his teaching is "indoctrinating;" and all these things are brought about by words. How



appropriate that "aptitude to teach" should be *the mark* of a minister of *the word*. Teaching, then, being the proper work of the minister, let us inquire into his qualifications. In the school room, teacher and master are synonymous. So too our Bible translates the Greek word for "teacher" by the English word "master." The root of the word master is "most," meaning one who has the most of all, more than any body else. The Latin "magister" has for its root, the comparative of "much," meaning one who has more than another. The Hebrew for master means "much," and for scholar "little;" all teaching the truth: that the master must know. The master, says the Hebrew, must be "much;" "more" says the Latin; "most" says the German. This superiority must be genuine, not assumed; it must be intrinsic, not official. It is a mockery and a fraud, for one who is inferior, to assume to teach his superiors. It is a futile and pernicious attempt to suspend or annul a fundamental law of God. To the capable, by a divine right, belong place and power; and whether we infringe on this right, in church, state or school, the divine statute avenges itself. If sciolists control our schools, ignorance and impudence will shame the land. If wicked rulers fill the throne, men will hide themselves, and the land mourn; and if the church ordains novices and installs impotence, she must look for "dotings about questions" and "strifes of words," for "babblings, and foolish and unlearned disputes." The teacher, then, must be of robust mind, capable of laying hold of truth and error both; drawing the former from her deep well, and dragging the latter from her dark haunts. If a man have a vision to tell, he may tell it but if; not, he has no right to take the name and the place of a prophet. The physician who knows no more of disease than his patients, is justly branded with the stigma of quack; but what shall we say of him, who takes the name of a teacher, and yet knows not as much as his pupils. He preaches not so much from a pulpit as from a pillory. Of such a preacher it may be said, possibly, as David said of Ahimaaz, "he is a good man, and cometh with good tidings," but discreet men will rather adopt Joab's language—"wherefore wilt thou run my son, seeing thou hast no tidings ready?" A weak ministry may be less wicked than a hireling ministry, but it is doubtful whether it is less hurtful. The source of its weakness may be threefold. It may be because of inadequate endowments and acquisitions; the want of the power of expression; or it may be from the

most serious cause—a want of spiritual life. It is not enough, then, that the preacher be in advance of his hearers, in those matters which pertain specially to his work; he must also possess the faculty of making his superior endowments of mind, knowledge and grace available, for their strength, intelligence and piety. It is difficult to define the nature, or measure the power of the didactic faculty. The genius of teaching is as much a peculiarity, as the genius of painting. It is not enough for the artist to conceive one of Raphael's cartoons, he must execute it, if he would be called a painter. So the teacher must not only have thoughts, and good ones, but he must be able to tell them, and tell them much better than any one else, or he is no preacher, nor called to preach. Some minds think in the forms of instruction, and feel in the modes of persuasion. They are natural teachers—so natural that the smallest stock of knowledge, some seven items in their hands, like the Chinese puzzle, assume a thousand different, yet intelligible and instructive shapes. It may be that his knowledge is all in a bundle of anecdotes, but he weaves them into such a magic web, that his audience are entranced. His genius shines through all, and like Angelo, his heads, though done with charcoal, are heads of Jupiter—so awful, so impressive, so divine. His capital may be only Scripture texts, but so potent and cunning is his genius, that these utterances of God are reared into a temple of truth, sublime in its proportions, and full of religious light. Or it may be that, without a fund of secular parables, or sacred texts, and possessed only of a lively experience of Christ in his heart, he shall unfold his soul with a force that shall confute sceptics, and instruct the learned. Such are some of the manifestations of the teaching gift, and no one, who has sat under the ministrations of this talent, but has felt its force, and will be ready to admit, that to teach in the highest of all schools, the preacher must have some of it, or must not preach.

One more quality must enter into the character of the New Testament minister, since he is to be a Gospel teacher. *He must share the Gospel grace.* Origen was right, the Bible has an occult sense, a hidden meaning. It uses the words of time, but it teaches the principles of eternity. Its sounds are earthly, but they have a heavenly echo. Its colors too, like the rainbow, reach from earth to heaven. It needs a spiritual vision to see the spiritual colors; a spiritual ear to hear the spiritual sound; a spiritual heart to understand its spiritual meaning. If a minister does not know these spirit-

nal truths, how can he teach them? They are foolishness to him, how then can he make them wisdom to his hearers? Plainly then, a preacher of the Gospel must be imbued with its spirit, before he can be entrusted with its message. Without this, he may be a teacher "apt to teach," but never a Gospel teacher. Never a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing "the word," i. e., the Gospel of Christ. The practical duties which belong to the office of a Gospel teacher, are well summed up by Paul in these words: "doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness."

*The first duty then, of the preacher, is doctrine—instruction.* Diffusing knowledge in divine things. Disseminating religious truth. Appearing among his people, with his mind filled with knowledge. In discharging this part of his office, he is as a sower going forth to sow. In his hand should be both abundant and good seed. It cannot be supposed that in assuming to sow truth, he should go forth with error, or in undertaking to sow a field, he should not carry seed enough for a garden. The field of the minister is the world, and the very ignorance of men of the world, as to their present and full duties, makes it necessary that a large supply of knowledge should be laid up in the preacher's mind for use. It is true, a man can teach without knowing much. But how can he teach? A piece of barren land can grow grain, but how much, and how good grain can it grow? There is just as much difference between the pupils of a superficial or a profound teacher, as there is between the products of a thin soil and a deep one. Teaching is a vital process. The teacher must energize his pupil's mind, stirring up its hidden forces. The man that does not think, cannot make others think, and if hearers do not think, they cannot feel, and if they do not feel, they do not learn. Preaching is not merely *uttering* wisdom, but it is *communicating* it. Now a superficial, spiritless preacher, is no preacher at all; he is a babbler. It may be said, many hearers cannot understand profound thoughts, recondite speculations, intricate reasonings, hard words—perhaps not: but will men learn to think deeply, by hearing shallow preaching? or will they learn to reason long and closely, by listening to sermons that contain no reason at all? But suppose that some of a congregation cannot understand everything of every sermon, yet there will be some who can, and our plan should be, rather to raise the ignorant and weak, than to lower the intelligent and strong.

The kingdom of God is a monarchy, in talent and power, though a democracy in privileges and motives. Everybody is commanded to enjoy the means of knowledge, but only some succeed, and only a few rule, and only one is the highest. Now it is the minister's duty to preach something for all; but also, so to preach that his best hearers will always have something to grow on. One educated, thoroughly furnished hearer, is worth more to God and the church, than a dozen of weak, indolent and unthrifty listeners. Now we say that a sermon that goes down to the bottom of a man's mind, is the best sermon. Such a discourse raises the whole soul. Such preaching is like subsoil ploughing, contributing to the moisture, freshness and richness of the soil. If a discourse makes a man think, and sends him home thinking, he has grown. He has put another ring to his trunk, another fibre has come out from his root, another bud has swollen on his topmost branch. Opinions are like fashions; the few invent them, the many wear them.

*The second duty of the minister, is 'reproof—that is, conviction by argument.* This term brings clearly before us the rational nature of a preacher's work. This thought has already been alluded to, but it deserves further notice. Man is a rational animal. Reason and understanding are just as much a part of his nature, as are conscience and will. Man's freedom implies that he is to be dealt with by arguments. The whole economy of nature is arranged with reference to man's rationality. Instinct, which governs and guards brutes, is comparatively weak in man; and as his intellect and years increase it grows weaker; and in heaven, I think, he will have none at all. His reasoning powers are his means of livelihood here, and his resources for preparing for a hereafter. If, then, the search for and comprehension of that better life is commended to reasoning creatures, should not the instruction, which the preacher gives them, be addressed to their understanding?

Nothing is more characteristic of an awakened interest in religion, or any other important subject, than an inquiring, reasoning, debating state of mind. Never are the prospects of the church more encouraging, than when good people and bad people begin to reason. From the collision of the mind with truth, the sinner with law, results are sure to follow. I love to read those parts of our Savior's life, where questionings arose among his hearers. Some good was sure to

follow. Equally interesting to me, are the disputations of Paul. When he encounters the Jew in the Synagogue at Damascus, or on the temple stairs; when he pleads before Felix or Agrippa; when he enters the school of Tyrannus, or the Agora at Athens, and reasons with his hearers, and makes them reason, I know something will follow. It always is so. The stormy times of the Reformation were times of deep conviction, earnest and even angry disputation. The days when Cromwell's soldiers filled up the leisure of their campaigns by reading and debate, were the palmy days of Puritanism. Let the minister, therefore, aim at conviction—conviction of truth, of error, of sin, of death. Let him bring his people face to face with duty and law. Let him tie them to the truth by bands of logic. Let him load their understandings with arguments. Let him reduce them to the dilemma of sinning in the face of argument; of doing wrong in the light and presence of right. Let the hearer go home feeling that if he will sin, he must do it willfully, and with an effort; and, I assure you, the fruits of such preaching will appear decidedly, somewhere.

*A third duty of the Gospel teacher, is correction—setting things right.* The preacher finds a world ignorant and indifferent, needing instruction and conviction; but he finds too, a world full of wrong, and therefore needing to be set right. After all that has been said on this subject, it need not be argued that this world is very much out of order, and very much bent on wrong. "There is none that doeth good, no not one." Look through your neighborhood, who is perfect—look through your city, take into your survey the whole human family—not one. Now to be a reformer, a minister needs much sound wisdom. He must be a profound student of the principles of men's thoughts and feelings. He must be far and clear-sighted. He must know more than his neighborhood or church. He must know men and things. He must be conversant with the history of men. The race is a unit, a living whole. It develops itself under the same great laws of God. To know its past, is to predict and guide its future. The law of right is the same, the heart is the same, motives are the same, the Holy Spirit is the same; but all else is changed, all else is changing. Art, science, literature, social, civil and political life, customs, laws and manners.

Now the preacher must use the *old law*, the *old motives*, &c., but he must apply them to the *new circumstances*; ap-

plication then, is the preacher's point of departure. Hence plainly he must "preach to the times." Each age, each country, each church and each individual exhibits a particular phase of sin. It is ever the same old sin, but always a different phase; the old fact, with a new face. Now it is formalism, now sectarianism, then covetousness, then pride, then pleasure. Selfishness has as many Awatars as Vishu. Now, as a physician, should the minister prescribe for the hand, when the eye is sick? or for the stomach, when the patient is lame? The Pharisees were formalists, hypocrites and covetous; what should Christ preach to them? Herod a debauchee, what should John the Baptist preach to him? The Romish church presented a different problem to Luther, from that which the English church offered to Whitfield. The preacher, therefore, in setting things right, it seems to me, ought to take hold of the things which are wrong, and not the things which are not wrong.

*The fourth duty of the minister of the Gospel is, to instruct in righteousness.* When men's minds have been enlightened by knowledge, convicted by argument, reformed from sin, then they must be educated in holiness. This is the minister's last and best work, and I think I may say for all of them, this is their most grateful duty. It is so pleasant, so sweet, so full of all comfort, to go in and out with your people in peace, not so much correcting their faults as commending their graces. Nothing can be more painful for a minister of the Gospel of peace, than to feel that his hearers, and especially his people, think him their enemy, because he so frequently must tell unpleasant truths. He would so much sooner always preach the precious promises of God, than even occasionally proclaim the terrors of the law, if you kept the law, or tried to keep it, or wished to keep it. The beauty of holiness is so much more consonant with his feelings, than are the deformities of sin, that he would never tire in unfolding its charms, encouraging to its practice, and dwelling on its future inexhaustible felicities. The Song of Solomon is pleasanter to him, than the burdens of Isaiah; or even the lamentations of Jeremiah. Does he love to prophesy evil? Does he love the terrors of Hell? Does he love to be a man of bitterness and strife and contention? Oh no, not at all, not at all; but he must preach these sharp things, and he can only do it, and does do it, because he loves your souls, and because his Savior loves you too. If it were not for this, he

would instruct you evermore in righteousness. He would delight to lead you "in green pastures, and by still waters,"—with the voice of the gentle shepherd of Israel ever in your ears.

If in this popular sketch of the proper work and qualifications of a New Testament bishop, we have represented the truth, as it has been revealed in the pastoral letters, and in the apostolic history and practice, then some plain and important inferences follow, as to the endowments, natural and gracious, which should be sought in those who "desire the office of a bishop;" the intellectual training, which they should receive and the theological discipline demanded by this work. No demand for ministers ever can be so urgent, as to justify the introduction into the ministry of unqualified persons. No exigency will excuse sudden "laying on of hands." An important and efficient mode of increasing the ministry, is to make it honorable. A thoroughly furnished preacher of the Gospel, next to the spirit of God, will incite the most men to this work. A good minister turns his church into a training school for the church of God. We think too, that if the above is anything like a correct view of the minister's official duty and qualifications, it throws important light on his relations to his parish. It suggests the limits of his duties to his people. We all know that there has grown up a sentiment or prejudice, in our time, which makes a distinction between the pastoral and the didactic office of the minister. So morbid has this feeling grown, that even the minister's wife is included in the bond of her husband's duties, as a pastor, though, we believe, never as a teacher, albeit the apostle Paul, however minute as to the duties of deacons and deacons' wives and bishops, never says a word about ministers' wives. Have people in our day supplemented this hiatus in inspiration concerning ministers' wives' duties? saying *so much*, because the Spirit said *so little*, and shall we follow men, or shall we follow Paul?

We would, in the light of the preceding discussion, venture the remark, that the exacting demands upon the minister, as a pastor, rather than a teacher, are superstitious and papistic, proceeding on the assumption that he is better, and is bound to be better, than other Christians, and that his visits and prayers are better than those of other good people; and that his "virtue" is so abundant, that it passes even to his wife, so that, as a minister's wife, her prayers and her visits are more



saving than the prayers and visits of any other good Christian wife. We think if "the pastor" were, in some degree, to retract within "the teacher," that the membership would be more "pastoral," and the minister, instead of, in some sense, "serving tables," might give himself more fully to "the word and prayer." The constitution of a working Christian church is drawn out in Rom. 12: 4—8. That is the standard toward which minister and people should labor. That would give us the right men, in the right place.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE SABBATH.

By Rev. A. H. Lochman, D. D., York, Pa.

Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.—Ex. 20: 8.

AMONG all Christian nations, we find one day out of seven set apart, for rest from the ordinary employments and pursuits of life, and for the worship of God.

The necessity and importance of such a day, even for the State, in reference to moral, as well as intellectual and physical culture, has been acknowledged by the wisest and best of statesmen.

Experience has clearly established the fact, that a people uninterruptedly engaged in the pursuits and enjoyments of the world, will gradually lose a feeling sense of their dependence upon and obligation to their Creator, forget their high and endless destiny, and sink into immorality and licentiousness.

Experience has likewise abundantly corroborated another fact, viz., that both the faculties of the mind and the energies of the body, require a day of rest, to recruit their exhausted strength. Hence the kind and benevolent Creator has appointed such a day for the welfare and happiness of his creatures. For the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.—Mark 2: 27.

I am well aware that many are of the opinion, that the appointment of this day rests upon human authority. That it was set apart by wise and sagacious statesmen, for the welfare and recreation of the people. If this were the case,



how did it happen, and whence did they conceive the idea of appointing precisely the seventh day, or the seventh portion of time? Why not the sixth, or eighth or ninth?

No, He who created man, with all the powers of body and the faculties of his mind, also knows whether any and precisely how much time is necessary for him to rest and recruit his exhausting energies, both of body and mind. To dwell upon his high and exalted destiny, and to adore and worship his Creator.

And he has appointed the seventh day, or the seventh part of our time for this purpose, immediately after the creation of man. For we read, Gen. 2: 2, 3, "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his works which God created and made."

God here designed to show that man also should labor six days, and rest from his labors on the seventh. This is clearly to be inferred from the commandment he gave on this subject on Mount Sinai, Ex. 20: 8, 11—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son nor thy daughter, thy man servant nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates." And in assigning the reason for this rest, God clearly intimates that he, in the beginning, set apart the seventh day. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

God, however, not only rested on the seventh day, but hallowed it, invested it with a special honor, set it apart from all other days, for holy and sacred purposes.

The recognition of such a day we find again, Ex. 16: 23. "This is that which the Lord hath said: To-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord."

And when God gave the commandments on Mount Sinai, he did not first give instructions in reference to a day which they should keep holy, but speaks of it as appointed long before, as a matter of which they had long been cognizant—remember *the* Sabbath day. We maintain, therefore, that this day is not of human, but of divine appointment.

Some are of the opinion that the day originally appointed by God, was designed merely for the Jews, and that the obligation to keep one day out of seven holy unto the Lord, ceased with the abrogation of the ritual observances of the Jewish polity, and that, consequently, the observance of a particular day is a matter of mere expediency. In opposition to this view, we remark:

First. If the Sabbath, or day of rest, were a matter of mere human appointment or of expediency, and not intimately interwoven with the plan and purposes of God, in regard to the welfare and salvation of the human race; the due remembrance of it would long since have passed away, or would, at best, be only associated with the records of antiquity. We remark,

Secondly. This day was set apart from the beginning, while our first parents were yet in a state of innocence, and consequently before all the ceremonies of the Levitical law, and was, no doubt, designed for the whole human race.

Thirdly. This institution stands upon the same footing as that of marriage. Marriage was appointed before the fall, but as it was designed for the whole human race, it existed after the fall, before and under the law, and after its abrogation, and although the institution itself may have been enshrouded with various ceremonial observances, and many and severe penalties annexed to the violation of it, still the abrogation of these ceremonies and penalties, could in no wise affect or annul the original institution. The same may be said of the Sabbath, although through the Levitical law, many ritual observances may have been united with it, which were only designed for and obligatory upon the Jews, yet the putting away of these observances could in no wise affect the original institution; we maintain, therefore, the perpetual obligation of keeping one day out of seven holy unto the Lord.

Lastly. We remark Jesus Christ teaches us expressly, Mark 2: 27, the Sabbath was made for man. Not for our first parents, nor for the Israelites, under the old covenant merely, but for mankind in general, under all circumstances, in every age.

It may, however, be objected here, that the seventh was the day originally set apart, whereas the first day is now universally observed by Christians. Is not this contrary to the design of the Almighty? Have you any express command for the change of day? We answer unhesitatingly No; we

have no express injunction for the change. But we have reasons and arguments sufficient to convince every sincere and candid inquirer, and to justify the Christian church in its observance of the first day of the week.

1. God in his wisdom has appointed the seventh part of our time to be specially set apart, for rest from the ordinary employments of life, and for his worship. Now if we observe the first day, we employ the same portion of time in the manner required, as if we observed the seventh day.

2. When God gave the commandment, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," he appears to have made a distinction between the Sabbath itself, as a divine institution, and the day on which it was to be observed. The Sabbath, as such, is to be kept holy. We are to remember the Sabbath the seventh part of our time, without any special reference to the particular day. For if we examine the commandment, we will find that the words "remember," "blessed and hallowed it," have a special reference to the ordinance, and not to the day on which it was to be observed. It is not written, remember the seventh day, but remember the Sabbath day. Nor is it written, "wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," but "wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

3. As God rested on the seventh day from all the works which he had made, the Sabbath was specially set apart for the contemplation of his glorious attributes, as displayed in the works of creation. If, however, afterwards, a work was performed which more gloriously displays the perfections of the Deity, we should presume at least that the day on which this work was completed, should be kept as the holy day, in order that this greater work might be continually kept in remembrance, and that the children of men might have a clearer, more glorious exhibition of the character of Jehovah, and be penetrated with a deep and an abiding sense of their obligations to him.

But the work of redemption is unquestionably greater and more glorious, than that of creation. And as Jesus Christ arose from the dead on the first day, and by his resurrection has finished, crowned and sealed the great work of the world's redemption, we should judge that this day would be the most appropriate for Christians to observe as the day of rest, the Sabbath, the Lord's day. And this appears to have been the opinion of the Lord and his disciples, for

4. We have the example of Jesus and his apostles in confirmation of the observance of the first day.

On the evening of the day on which he arose from the dead (the first day), as the disciples were assembled, Jesus appeared in their midst with the salutation, "Peace be unto you."—John 20: 19. This circumstance, in itself, might perhaps furnish but little proof for the change from the seventh to the first day, but when taken in connection with the twenty-sixth verse, "And after eight days again his disciples were assembled," it affords presumptive evidence that from the time of his resurrection, Jesus and his disciples kept the first day instead of the seventh; and if we follow the example of our Lord and his disciples, we will not be in danger of erring in reference to this or any other duty.

5. The first day was also particularly singled out and consecrated, by the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles. It was the day on which the Gospel was first preached, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven with such manifest power that three thousand were converted. It was then that God honored, set apart, and hallowed the New Testament Sabbath.

6. And lastly, the keeping of the first day of the week is intimately interwoven with the history of the church in every age, from the days of the apostles unto the present time. In every age, in all Christian lands, the first day has been kept as the day of rest, the Christian Sabbath.

But how is this day to be kept?

This brings us to consider the due observance of the day. And here we remark:

1. We are to refrain from the ordinary occupations of life.

This was the express command of God in reference to the Sabbath, under the Jewish dispensation. "On it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates."

But the moral law contained in the ten commandments, has never been annulled. Jesus tells us, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."—Matt. 5: 17.

And it is specially worthy of note, that when Jesus made this remark, he must have had a particular allusion to the moral law of the commandments, for he immediately enters upon an exposition of some of them, as, for example, Thou shalt not kill (v. 21), thou shalt not commit adultery (v. 27).

This also appears to have been the sense of the church of Jesus Christ in general; for the ten commandments are found in the Catechisms of all denominations of Christians.

If, therefore, the moral law of the commandments remains in force, then we also are bound, on this day, to abstain from the ordinary pursuits of life. We, our sons and daughters, our servants and our cattle.

This, in itself, exerts an important and salutary influence upon our moral sensibilities, and will lead to profitable reflection. When the busy marts of business are closed, when the sound of the workshop is not heard, when the plough rests in the furrow, when all is hushed in quiet, when old and young have laid aside their soiled garments, and decked themselves as if for some festive scene, is it not calculated to call forth profitable reflection, and to excite emotions of a calming, hallowing character? Does not this very fact loosen the grasp with which so many fondly cling to earth, and seem to whisper to them, you are in this world, not merely to eat and drink, and amass riches, but for a higher and nobler purpose, to contemplate and prepare for your eternal destiny.

Were men continually engaged in an uninterrupted routine of business and toil; were no day appointed on which the anxieties, and labors, and pursuits of business were suspended, they would become so wedded to, and entangled with the concerns of this world, that nothing could call their attention and affections away from these to something higher, holier and enduring. If there were no day on which we were called to abstain from the ordinary occupations of life, there could be no public worship of God, and how, without this, could the holy doctrines, the sublime precepts and sacred ordinances of the religion of Jesus Christ, be kept in continual and lively remembrance.

In the nature of things, then, if there is a necessity for the appointment of a day for the worship of Almighty God, for the serious contemplation of our destiny for another world, and for attending to the interests of our immortal souls, there must consequently be a cessation from the ordinary business of life.

Works of necessity, charity, and mercy are, however, not forbidden on the Lord's day.

What we are to understand by these, and what works come under this category, the Savior gives us distinctly to understand, Matt. 12: 10. When the Savior was about to heal a

man who had a withered hand, the hypocritical Pharisees murmured, and asked him, is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day? To them he replied, what man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold of it and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? And again, Luke 13: 11—15. When he healed a woman which had a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself, he replied to these sanctimonious Pharisees, "Doth not each one of you loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering, and ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound, lo these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?"

Therefore, it is not only lawful, but a duty, to help the distressed, to succor the needy, to visit and wait upon the sick, and the like, on the Lord's day, as well as any other time. But to gather in the harvest, because you fear the weather may become unfavorable, to engage workmen under the plea you have no other time, to pay social and pleasure visits, to look over and cast up accounts, post your books, to write letters on business, to read the secular papers of the day, and things of this sort, are not only inappropriate, but also sinful on the Lord's day.

Here I cannot refrain from adverting to and reprobate a practice which obtains to a great extent in some sections. Many persons, and even members of the church, single out the Sabbath to visit their friends and acquaintances. One day they meet at this house, and the next they meet at another place. Great preparations are made for a Sunday feast. The servants are all engaged in making suitable provisions for the company. They eat and drink, and engage in light-minded, frivolous, and even sinful conversation; canvass the character of their neighbors, laugh at and ridicule their more conscientious acquaintances, who attend the services of the sanctuary. Thus one Sunday after another is spent. Will any one say this is right; this is spending the day in a becoming and profitable manner? I think not. Such persons not only deprive themselves of the privileges and blessings of the sanctuary, but also keep others away, who might perhaps go, and rob their domestics of a day which God has instituted for their good.

Again. The Lord's day ought not to be spent in idleness and laziness.

There are many who, from conscientious scruples, or from fear of sacrificing the good opinions of their fellow-men, will refrain from engaging in their ordinary business, or from performing any manual labor, but who feel no scruples of conscience in spending the day in lounging about in the house, in strolling over the fields, in attending to matters about the barn, or in sleeping away the half of the day. They scarcely ever attend the public worship; they scarcely ever read their Bible, or any religious book. If they read anything, it is a political paper, or a ludicrous story in an Almanac, or a work of fiction. Of what advantage is the day of the Lord to such? Nay, instead of being an advantage, they turn it into a curse, for they incur the guilt of desecrating a day which God requires to be kept holy.

Again, much less should this day be devoted to sinful amusements and wickedness.

This is done to an alarming extent. Scarcely has the day commenced, when they clothe themselves in their best style, seek for their companions, and then sally forth. You may see crowds on steamboats, on the cars, in pleasure gardens, in public houses, and hear the merry song, the boisterous laugh, the witty jest, the low and vulgar remark. Many whose families are in the most needy circumstances, thus spend their hard-earned wages of a whole week's toil, and return in the evening, to maltreat and abuse their families.

It is true, we have but little hope of reaching such, and of benefiting them; for such scarcely ever purchase, much less read a book, which might be useful to them. But it might, nevertheless, in the providence of God, be the case, that perhaps a father might put this book in the hands of a prodigal son; or a friend might lay it in the way of a friend, and that through the influences of the blessed Spirit, one or another might be brought to reflect upon his course, and turn from the evil of his ways unto God.

Or if this result be not attained, perhaps some one who is in danger of being enticed by evil companions, may take warning, and be kept from ruin, which may God in mercy grant.

Again, it is our duty, on this day, regularly to attend, and devoutly to engage in the public worship of God.

The public worship of the sanctuary has a greater and more extensive influence than the generality of men are willing to admit.



It exerts a general influence upon the community at large. It moulds public sentiment, as well as the moral and religious feeling of the community.

This is sufficiently apparent when we contrast the state of things in this respect, in the community where public worship is constantly maintained, and regularly attended, with those communities where there is either no public worship, or where it is neglected by the mass of the people.

The public worship of God has, however, also a special salutary influence upon individuals. By it the remembrance of God, of our dependence upon and obligations to him, are kept in lively remembrance. The great plan of salvation is vividly portrayed, salvation freely offered through Jesus Christ, our duties towards God, ourselves and our fellow-men, not only set forth, but enforced by every consideration which can have any weight. There the understanding is enlightened, conscience awakened, the heart touched, and wooed and won for Christ. The apostle knew full well the importance and necessity of public worship. Hence he exhorted believers of his day, Heb. 10: 25, "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together as the manner of some is."

But how many are there, who either neglect public worship altogether, or at least attend only occasionally. Such seek to excuse themselves in a variety of ways. Either they don't feel as well as they might wish, or it is too cold, too hot, the roads are rather bad, they can't well leave home, circumstances require their presence in the family. If, however, it were another day, and they had any important business, or if they could make a profitable speculation, think you that any or all of the excuses alluded to, would keep them back? I tell you, no.

Others say there is nothing which we can learn in the house of God, which we do not already know; and yet an indifferent speaker, and a man of ordinary attainments, may utter many useful and important truths; he may revive impressions which may have been slumbering for a long time in your mind, and unexpectedly recall you to a sense of your duty.

Another replies, I can worship God in my closet, and read the Bible in my dwelling, and ponder over important truths, at my own fireside. But the question is, do you do this? are you not prevented by a variety of obstacles, which continually present themselves? Does not experience teach us that our soul is more easily warmed into devotion, and the



affections more readily called forth, and holy aspirations excited, when we are engaged with our fellow-men in the exercises of God's house?

Who, then, would neglect this sacred duty, and deprive himself of so exalted a privilege? Is it not a wise and gracious provision of the church, made by the great Head of the church, Jesus Christ himself? He who absents himself from the house of God, neglects an important duty, robs and cheats his own soul of its wholesome influences, gives a bad example to others, and cannot keep the day in an appropriate manner.

Again, we are not to neglect private devotion in our families on the Lord's day.

A part of the day should be spent in devotional exercises, in holding communion with God. This is a duty which should not be neglected on the other days of the week; it is, however, specially appropriate on the Lord's day. On this day we have more leisure, we are not so liable to have our thoughts distracted, and our minds called away by the interruptions of our secular calling. The sacred stillness that prevails around us, and the idea that thousands of our fellow-mortals are engaged with us, in the same holy exercises, cannot but have a quickening, enlivening, hallowing influence upon our spirit, and aid it in its aspirations heavenward, and in commingling its notes of praise and voice of supplication with those of thousands which ascend to the throne of all grace.

This day is, however, also peculiarly calculated for sober and profitable reflection and meditation. Everything around us seems favorable to the performance of this duty; we ought to reflect, and seriously to meditate upon our condition and character; upon the being and attributes and works of God; the plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, and our duties in the various relations of life. Especially ought we to read and meditate upon the word of God, to call to our aid works on practical and experimental piety, and lay to heart and seek to experience the power, and practice the duties of our holy religion.

Finally, on this day we ought, in imitation of our Divine Master, to improve every opportunity of doing good. He healed the sick and visited the distressed. He taught us by his example, and enforced it with "wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day." A variety of opportunities of doing good on this day, present themselves. We may persuade others to attend the services of God's house on this day, and

thus bring them under Gospel influences. We can engage in the Sabbath School, and hunt out many children whose parents are thoughtless and careless, and induce them to attend. We may visit the sick, relieve the distressed, cheer the widow and the orphan in their affliction, and thus, in some humble degree, imitate the example of our Lord.

And now we pray you to consider, lay to heart, and practice what, in much imperfection, we have said in reference to the sanctifying of God's holy day, and may God in his infinite mercy and goodness, dispose your hearts and give you grace to remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### A WANT IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH MET BY THE FOUNDING OF THE MISSIONARY INSTITUTE.\*

By Prof. R. Weiser, President of Central College, Des Moines, Iowa.

On an occasion like this, when the Corner-Stone of a Missionary Institute, the first of the kind in the United States, is laid, it would seem our duty honestly to examine the merits of such an enterprise. This we will do in the light of the history of the church, and of the Bible. We live in an age of improvement, and if we wish to advance in the church with the spirit of improvement in the world, we cannot be governed by what our fathers did. We must strike out into new channels of Christian enterprise, in order to develop the energies of the church.

The Lutheran church always has been, and is now, and we hope ever will remain, an educated and an educating church. The founders of our church in Europe were all learned men; many of them were giants in intellect, and vast magazines of learning; by their wisdom and genius they revolutionized, not only the church, but also the world of letters. As ministers of the Lutheran church, we would be untrue to that church, if we would seek to reduce the standard of education, especially in those who minister at her altars, and who are to

\* An Address delivered at the laying of the Corner-Stone of the Missionary Institute, Selinsgrove, Pa., September 1st, 1858, and published by request of the Board of Directors.

carry forward her enterprizes, when we have gone. But still as we consider the knowledge of God of more importance than mere human wisdom, we will, on this interesting occasion, endeavor to show you the paramount importance of sound theological knowledge, and genuine piety in ministers of the Gospel.

In advocating the claims of the Missionary Institute, we shall be obliged to glance at the history of the Lutheran church, and present the trials and conflicts through which she has passed. The Institution has naturally and spontaneously grown out of the wants of the church. The Lutheran church has a history which may be divided into four periods, viz :—  
1. The age of revolution. 2. The age of progress and conquest. 3. The age of theoretical symbolism, and 4. The age of conflict between symbolic orthodoxy and true piety, or between high churchism and experimental religion. To each of these periods we will now call your attention, and from the facts elicited, we will illustrate the truth of our position.

#### *I. The age of Revolution.*

This age in the Lutheran church may be dated from Oct. 31, 1517, when Luther nailed his famous ninety-five theses upon the church door at Wittenberg. Leo X. was then slumbering in security at the head of the church, little dreaming that an obscure monk, in a distant province in Germany, was then laying his plans to shake the whole Papal church to its very centre. No sooner was the clarion voice of Luther heard, than the nations of the earth who had been sighing and groaning for liberty of conscience, were startled as from the dead; and they rushed in crowds to the standard of the truth, which he had erected. From the apostles' times there had always been those who stood up bravely for Jesus. There had been pious, holy ones, in every age of the church—like beacon lights, they were scattered all along the path of the church, sometimes, indeed, standing out in bold relief, like bright stars in a dark night—and the very darkness by which they were surrounded, only increased the splendor of their virtues.

The church of Christ was ushered into the world amid a revival of religion; for it was not fully organized until after the three thousand were converted on the day of Pentecost. The promises of the Savior to his church have never been ignored. The gates of hell were not to prevail against his

church; and they never have prevailed, and they never will. Heaven and earth may pass away, but not one jot or tittle of his word shal ever fail. The nations of the earth may be convulsed with revolutions; earthquakes may shatter and engulf half our globe, planets may forsake their orbits, and rush with maddened fury through the immensity of space; blazing comets, in their eccentric courses, may dash the satellites of other systems into pieces, and scatter their fragments like snow flakes over the wide domains of God, but his promises concerning his church can never fail. This is a precious, a comforting thought to his people, and its truth has been verified in every age of the world. From the age of the apostles to that of Constantine the Great, the church passed unscathed through the fires of ten pagan persecutions. Her walls were cemented with the tears, and the blood of her martyrs. Never did the church achieve such triumphs as when her martyrs suffered and bled, and died. The great founder of his church, Jesus Christ, led the way in this baptism of blood. During the first three hundred years, the church was blessed with the labors of the apostles, and the Lord's disciples—all holy and pious men—who were full of the Holy Ghost and of faith. These men, too, were deeply versed in the theology of the heart. Some sects, to support their errors, contend that they were not learned men, but ignorant and uneducated. It is true, they were not learned in the liberal professions, but they were men of good common education, and sound sense; they were also somewhat advanced in life, for Peter and some of the others had families before they were called to the ministry. Then, too, it must be remembered that these men were under the tuition of the Great Teacher for nearly three years. And what are all the advantages we now possess, even in our best theological seminaries, compared with theirs? What would we not give if we could now go directly to Jesus, as they did, and ask him to explain some of those dark and hidden mysteries that have perplexed the church for ages? But we have Moses and the prophets, and the writings of Jesus and his apostles, and with these we must be content. We may not now sit at his feet, like Mary, or touch the hem of his garment, like the poor afflicted widow, but, by faith, we can still approach him. With these advantages, we should vastly prefer the education of the Lord's disciples, to our own. They were not required to spend years of toil and labor in acquiring the Greek and Hebrew languages—these were vernacular. So

also they had not to study the manners and customs of the Jews; nor had they to study huge systems of dogmatic theology. The immediate successors of the apostles, shared very largely in their advantages. Hence Father Clemens Romanus, Ignatius and Polycarp, who were cotemporary with the apostles, were learned men, possessing great advantages over their successors, and hence their views of Christianity should have great weight with all the followers of the Lord. Then come Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, all bright and shining lights in the church, and most of them among the most learned men in the world. During this period the fires of ten Pagan persecutions blazed forth in every province of the Roman Empire. Yet the church grew and multiplied. There were many, too, who were not so learned, yet they were useful. In the year 306 Constantine ascended the throne of the Cæsars, and then the church had peace. But no sooner were the fires of persecution quenched, than the more pernicious fires of religious controversy were kindled, and those fires have blazed on for ages, and, I suppose, will blaze on, until they are extinguished in the full light of the millennial glory. As controversy increased, true piety declined. The clergy, nursed, and fostered, and pampered in the arms of the State, became indolent, carnal and ambitious. The church of Christ never received a severer wound, than when she was united with the State. It was an alliance over which angels wept, and devils shouted a jubilee in hell. Nearly all the persecutions that the church of Christ has ever inflicted upon herself, has grown directly out of this union. From the year 306 to 606, the church had her trials and her conflicts. Error was often in the ascendancy, but, "Truth crushed to earth shall rise again." The church groaned under her severe trials, instead of leaning on the arm of her beloved, she leaned on an arm of flesh. Still God did not, even in that dark period, leave her without a witness. She was still graven on the palms of his hands, and dear as the apple of his eye. During this dark period, God raised up a Lactantius, famous for his learning, his piety, and his eloquence; who labored hard to roll back the tide of ignorance and sin; also an Athanasius, famous for his firmness and his piety, who stood firm amid all the errors of the Court. We see too, a Basil, a Hilary, an Ambrose, a Jerome, and an Augustine, the brightest star in the whole moral firmament. These holy and

pious men kept the fires of true piety burning upon the altar of God, from generation to generation. About this time commenced the workings of the mystery of iniquity. The Roman Catholic defection dates from 606. This was the year in which the Bishop of Rome was declared universal Bishop. With the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff commenced a system of errors of the most pernicious character. The worship of images was now introduced. Monks were resorted to; the sale of indulgences; the power of priestly absolution, and the doctrines of purgatory; all to oppress and delude the people. Forms and ceremonies took the place of true spiritual devotion. *Like priest like people.* The great mass of the priests were ignorant of letters, many could not even read; their theological education consisted in committing written forms of prayer and the Mass to memory, and repeating them off to the people. Preaching was almost universally neglected; the Bible was nowhere to be found; even some schools of theology had no Bible. Andrew Bodenstein, or Carlstadt, declared that he himself was made a Doctor of Divinity before he ever saw a Bible. And Luther found one chained at Erfurth. In this age of gross darkness, called with great propriety the "dark ages," we still see a few glimmerings of light struggling through the dense mists of error and superstition. We see in the pious Anglo-Saxon Willebrord, the true spirit of missions exemplified. We see, too, many of the Christian virtues clustering around the venerable Bede, and the illustrious Alcuin. In Claude of Turin, Alfred of England, in Berengarius and Anselm, we see how the grace of God in a dark age can triumph, even over sin and error. God had his holy ones during all this long dark night of error. From 1095, the age of the Crusades, to 1517, the age of the Reformation, the church was, if possible, even in a more deplorable condition. Theological education was altogether neglected; Duns Scotus, Aquinas, and other schoolmen, took the place of the Bible. The philosophy taught was mere unintelligible jargon; the theology was nothing but the legends of saints. But time would fail us to point out the sad state of the church. Yet even in this ignorant and wicked age, the Lord had his holy ones; persecuted it is true, but still firm and unshaken in their attachment to their Lord and Master. Peter Waldo, John Wickliffe, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and John Ziska—these were all faithful and true followers of the Lamb. But the darkest night must have an end. A dark, dark night of sin



and error had brooded over the church for a thousand years. Well may we here ask, must sin forever reign? must Pagan altars forever smoke? shall the human mind forever remain in bondage? shall the church of Rome forever trample under foot the ransomed of the Lord? has the Lord forgotten his promises? No, no! the day is beginning to dawn, the morning stars of the Reformation have risen above the horizon. Wickliffe and Huss flashed and blazed upon the world; the down-trodden nations of the world are looking for a brighter day. Just at the proper juncture of time God raised up Luther. His preaching produced powerful effects, such as had never been felt before in Germany. No wonder the people were carried away by his eloquence; his matter, his manner, his doctrines, were all different from any they had ever heard. The religion he preached was deeply imbedded in his very soul, his words flowed like honey from his lips, and fell like peals of thunder upon the hearts of his hearers. As a man and a preacher, take him all in all, he never had a superior, and perhaps never an equal. Luther's voice was sweet and manly, his elocution was faultless, his gestures easy and graceful, his powers of conception were rapid, his imagination vivid, his knowledge of human nature almost intuitive, his range of intellect vast and comprehensive, his piety fervent; add to all this a deep pathos, and an exuberance of feeling, a searching eye, and the zeal of a martyr, and you have the finished orator. Nature and art had combined their energies, and made Martin Luther altogether the greatest orator of ancient or modern times. And just such a man was needed for the crisis; until Luther rose, there was no power on earth that could cope with the church of Rome. Even kings and emperors had to bow in humble submission at the feet of the Pope. By his eloquence he shook the Roman church to its very centre. He feared no power on earth; Christ was his Master, and he acknowledged no other. The Bible was his creed, and he recognized no other authority.

This was indeed the age of revolution. Luther himself was learned in the Classics; his theology he learned from the Bible. Melancthon too, was a learned man; he too, like Luther, drew his theology from the Bible and St. Augustine. There were many other learned men in the age of the Reformation; but the great mass of the Romish priests who went over from Rome to our church, were not learned in theology or anything else; and during the first decade of this stirring period, men had no time to study theology. In 1529 Luther

and Melanchthon visited the churches in Saxony and Misnia; they found such an amount of ignorance, not only among the common people, but also among the clergy, that they were induced to prepare the two Lutheran catechisms, the smaller and the larger; the one for the people, the other for the clergy. In this visitation they found many pastors so ignorant and vicious, that they had to dismiss them. Luther was a wise master-builder in the temple of our Lord, and on account of the ignorance and prejudices, many things were retained in the Lutheran church, that should have been rejected. As, for instance, the celebration of the Mass, private confession, the celebration of the Lord's Supper in one kind, and exorcism; also the retaining of pictures and crucifixes in the churches, and the wearing of sacred vestments, thus keeping up a popish distinction in the church of Christ, between the clergy and the laity, that is not only not recognized, but utterly rejected in the New Testament. All true Christians are recognized in the New Testament as kings and priests unto God. And Luther himself, in his famous address to the nobility of Germany, fully acknowledges the universal priesthood of all Christians. According to the New Testament, every Christian who has the ability, has the right to preach the Gospel; he has not only the right to do it, but it is his solemn duty.

When Luther died, in 1546, Melanchthon was, by almost universal consent, acknowledged the leader of the Reformation. Things became more quiet; the schools and seminaries prospered; Melanchthon prepared, even before Luther's death, his *Theologici Loci*, the first regular system of theology in the Lutheran church. The Greek and Hebrew languages were studied. Such had been the ignorance of the Romish priests, that we are told of one who preached against the Reformation, and in warning his people against the books of heretics, asserted that the Greek Testament was from the devil, and whosoever read the Hebrew, was sure to become a Jew. Much had been accomplished; the powers of Rome were shaken; light had been shed upon the masses of Europe; many souls had been converted. But alas! Luther had scarcely closed his eyes, until his misguided followers again kindled the torch of discord. The controversy on the Lord's Supper, which had already commenced, in Luther's lifetime, and which he looked upon as having been settled at the celebrated Conference at Marburg, was renewed, and raged fearfully in the church, until she was almost destroyed.



These controversies, it is said, broke the heart of poor Melancthon, and he was in the habit of writing in the albums of his friends this sentence, viz: *A contentioso theologo libera nos, bone Deus*—From a contentious theologian good Lord deliver us. It is also said by one of his biographers, that after his death, a paper was found in his desk, which contained his reasons for desiring to leave this world, and says that he would then be delivered from the *rabies theologorum*—the fury of divines.

These terrible controversies destroyed the piety of the church, and led, in 1580, to the adoption of the *Form of Concord*. This was, of course, intended forever to settle the matter. But it only increased the contention. From this period we may date the age of contest between rigid symbolism and true piety. This has sometimes been called the iron age of symbolism, and is worthy a careful study. To say that there were no pious and holy men among strict symbolists, would be saying too much; for even good men are sometimes in error. Thus the sweetest singer in our Lutheran Zion, Paul Gerhard, was certainly a good and a holy man, and all must respect and honor his steadfast devotion to the symbolical books; yet we admire his devotion to the Bible still more. It was, after all, the Bible, and not the symbolical books, that made him savingly acquainted with Jesus Christ; and he would have been just as good and holy a man, if he had never seen the symbolical books. The fact is, we must remember that the great contest in our church, called Pietism, did not assume the form of symbolism and anti-symbolism. So far as the mere adherence to the symbols of the church was concerned, all parties seemed to be satisfied with them. But the contest seemed to be between theoretical and practical piety. John Arndt received the symbolical books, perhaps as cordially as his mortal enemy, John Corvinus, of Dantzic. Spener and Franke also received the symbolical books, but not in the sense in which their enemies and persecutors received them. During this polemic age, religion suffered immensely; Rome regained much of her lost territory. Is it any wonder? Rome had a far better show for her ancient dogmas, than the Lutheran church. Dr. Tholuck informs us that in this age, exegesis and practical theology were altogether neglected. The *Theologici Loci* were thrown aside, together with the Bible, to make room for "*Hutter's Loci Communes*," a work filled with dogmato-symbolism, and little of the Bible—full of patristic theology, but little of

the apostolic theology. The book of Concord, and not the Bible, was the umpire in all matters of doctrine. Exegesis and dogmatics were nothing more than weak attempts to justify the teachings of the symbolic books. Dr. Tholuck, in his history of the theology of the early part of the eighteenth century, says exegetical lectures were almost totally abandoned. Spener declares that he knew ministers who had spent six years at the University, and never heard a lecture on Scripture. How deplorable must have been the state of the church under such pastors! Gerhard says, "the most diligent church-goers live in open sin, and yet you dare not question their piety; and if you were to commend serious piety, they would call you a Pharisee or a hypocrite." Henry Müller, a pious divine, declaimed against the four dumb idols of the church, viz: "The Baptismal Font, the Confessional, the Pulpit and the Altar."

Ministers were not expected to be converted; all that was required was a correct external deportment, and a little knowledge of Rhetoric and Logic, with a thorough knowledge of the symbolical books. But such a state of things could not long exist. The Lutheran church needed another reformation. She could never accomplish her mission under such a system. God again raised up bold and fearless champions, who were able, with the hammer of divine truth, to demolish this lifeless orthodoxy. God raised up Arndt, Sebastian Schmidt, Dannhauer, Spener, Henry Müller, Breithaupt, Anthon, Franke, and others, who turned back the tide of worldliness and sin. And we bless God that these holy men were ever born, and permitted to labor in our church. Far be it from us, even to insinuate that there were no pious men in the Lutheran church before the days of Arndt. There were, even amid this dark night of symbolism, many devoted followers of the Lord in the Lutheran church. But we mean merely to assert, that with the preaching and writings of John Arndt, commenced a regular and systematic opposition to the lifeless orthodoxy of the church. Arndt labored and prayed faithfully to restore the church to her primitive apostolic condition. He encountered great opposition; he was charged with mysticism; when he preached on the necessity of regeneration, the old symbolical party insisted that the child was already regenerated in baptism; hence the doctrine of regeneration was looked upon by the symbolical party as heresy. Arndt may be regarded as the father of that form of Christianity which in Germany was called Pietism, in

England Puritanism, and which has been called Christianity in earnest. The next prominent laborer in this spiritual reformation of the Lutheran church, was Dr. James P. Spener, who was born in 1635. Though actuated by the same holy impulses which had influenced his illustrious predecessor, he directed his efforts in a different channel. Whilst Arndt labored to enlighten the ignorant masses, Spener with perhaps a deeper insight into the wants of the church, labored to improve the clergy, by instituting a better system of theology. In 1670 he published his *Pia Desideria*, the longings of the church for a better state of things. This work had a powerful influence in awakening the people and ministers to a sense of their danger and duty. He also wrote a series of practical sermons on the Lutheran catechism, and thus restored that excellent system of instruction, which had fallen into disuse. But the great work of this pious divine, was his agency in founding the University of Halle. He influenced the Elector of Brandenburg in founding this distinguished school, for the express purpose of teaching a better system of theology than was then taught in any Lutheran seminary. It was through the influence of Spener that Franke was appointed Professor at Halle. He was just the man for this great work; himself a man of talents and education, with a deep religious experience. Franke was assisted by Breithaupt and Anthon. This Institution was highly favored of God; it sent six thousand and thirty-two ministers into the church from 1694 to 1724, i. e. in thirty years—over two hundred a year. Taking the same number *per annum*, this Institution has sent out over thirty thousand ministers in one hundred and sixty-two years. What a blessing has it not been to the world and the church! Franke was not converted until after he was a minister; he entered fully into Spener's plans; the six thousand ministers who were sent out were all truly pious; they were scattered through the church; their influence was felt in India and in America; evangelical pietism took the place of cold orthodoxy; a new system of Biblical interpretation was inaugurated; missionaries were sent out to the ends of the world. In the early part of the eighteenth century, the University of Halle was the first Institution in the world, and it exerted an influence upon the church, such as no Institution had ever exerted before. This Institution was built in faith; it was consecrated by the prayers of Franke. No wonder, therefore, that the blessings of heaven and the benedictions of all good men have rested upon it.

The Lutheran church in America is deeply indebted to the University of Halle. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, the Father of our American Lutheran Zion, was educated here. The old orthodox symbolism of Germany fought long against the evangelical pietism of Halle. The contest was severe, and sometimes doubtful; at length the evangelical element triumphed, and symbolism was fairly driven from the field.

The next element of opposition to evangelical piety, was rationalism; this antagonism seems to have taken the place of the old symbolism. Hence the enemies of experimental piety always have, and do now, lay rationalism at the door of vital piety. This is on the same ground the Holsteiner lays the infidelity of his countrymen to the charge of the pious Claus Harms. It is true that, in the old iron age of symbolism, and farther back under the Papal system, when men were not permitted to think at all, there were few heretics. Rationalism grows out of the corruptions of human nature; and its great antagonist is experimental piety. And you might as well charge the Gnosticism and Nicolaitanism of the Apostolic age, upon the teaching of Christ and his disciples. The American Lutheran church was saved from the storms of rationalism that swept over the church in the Fatherland from 1780 to 1820. Whilst rationalism again reconquered the field in Germany, and poisoned even the University of Halle, our church in this country was safe. She multiplied, and God prospered her. Our church in this country, properly speaking, dates back to 1742, although it was in existence here for more than a century before. The spirit of evangelical piety that prevailed at Halle was inaugurated here, and became the prevailing element of our church. Although the symbolical books, especially the leading one, the Augsburg Confession, was not formerly rejected, yet we do not find that these symbols were overrated by the fathers of our American Lutheran church. They received the Augsburg Confession in the same way that it had been received by their fathers at Halle, i. e., as subordinate to the Bible, and receiving all its force from the Bible. The Lutheran church in this country, as is abundantly proved by the Liturgies, Hymn Books, the *Halle Annals*, and the other writings of the fathers, clearly set forth the evangelical tendencies of the fathers. Hence the system of interpretation of Scripture, and the manner of preaching adopted by Arndt, Spener and Franke, prevailed here. Mühlenberg, Kunze, Schmidt, Schultz, Heintzelman, Handschuh, Bager, the two

elder Kurtzs, and others, were all of this school. Helmuth, who was the first man in the Lutheran church in his day, may be regarded as the first theological school teacher in this country. Lochman and Schmucker the elder, were among his older pupils, and the greatest number of ministers of our church now in this country, were either educated by these men, or by their students.

Our Seminary at Gettysburg grew indirectly out of Dr. Helmuth's private Divinity school in Philadelphia, and all our other theological seminaries sprang from Gettysburg. The theological schools of Buffalo and Fort Wayne, are not of us; they are the pure representatives of the old rigid system of symbolic orthodoxy, perhaps somewhat modified by the spirit of the age. But we are not to flatter ourselves that the age of conflict between true pietism and symbolical orthodoxy is passed. True revivals of religion are, however, the best antidotes for forms and ceremonies. Strong efforts have been put forth in various quarters, to destroy the system of living piety in the church. A recently imported foreign element is now at work in our church, which threatens to drive us back, not to the system of our Halle forefathers, but to the system of rigid symbolism. Our seminary at Gettysburg and her daughters, have all been sound in the faith, and are now doing good. Why then, it may be asked, get up another institution for the education of ministers in our church? Why not rally around Gettysburg, and make her even more useful than ever? Can we not educate all our young men at the schools already in existence? To these questions we would simply reply, that ours is an age of progress, an age of experiments, the age of railroads and telegraphs, the age in which continents are chained together! Experience has taught us that our present mode of training men for the ministry is too slow; the churches in our connexion are outstripping the number of ministers; there is a vast disproportion between our churches and our pastors; we have twenty-four hundred churches, and only about eight hundred working ministers—three to one. This Institution is an experiment in this country, and is designed to meet a want that has long been felt in the church. It is not to be considered as a rival to other seminaries. It is, of course, intended to prepare ministers of the right stamp—not symbolists, but revival men, men who will stand on the foundation of Christ and his apostles. Nor is it the design of this Institution to lower the

general standard of ministerial education in our church. The founders of this Institution are themselves men of education, and they are well aware that the Lord requires different kinds of workmen in his temple. Whilst the church requires men of profound attainments to defend the citadel, she also needs sappers and miners, missionaries and working heroes, who may not be so learned, yet as useful as others.

The celebrated John Harris, D. D., an able theological writer of the present century, in a discourse on the opening of the Lancaster Independent College, says: "Our object is, not to furnish the student in divinity with the highest scholastic attainments; this the brevity of his term of study forbids; not to store his memory with facts and general information; mere scraps and dribblets of miscellaneous knowledge are all the most diligent collector of facts could take away with him; but to furnish him with that mental training which is necessary to the intelligent and useful discharge of the Gospel ministry. Knowledge, indeed, he will be acquiring, during the entire process; knowledge of the most useful kind; but that which is more important still, is, that he will obtain the power of using it, and of augmenting it indefinitely. His capital in actual knowledge may be comparatively small, but give him the right mental habits, and his 'pound will soon gain ten pounds' in addition. Show him the importance of great principles, and give him the power of dealing with them, and you have done more for him than if you had deposited an Encyclopædia of knowledge in his memory. For he knows the principle of a truth, has in effect mastered all the facts and phenomena belonging to it. He who knows the principle of a truth, like the angel in the midst of the sun, stands in its centre and sees to its circumference.

Further, that education of the ministry which we advocate, is meant to correspond with the state of education generally. If there are some classes of the community, for instance, still comparatively unacquainted with even the rudiments of knowledge, we would not insist that their ministers should receive the highest educational advantages. And as there are such classes, we rejoice in the existence of some theological institutions in which men of God are qualified, by a comparatively elementary course of training."

God sometimes converts and calls men to the work of the ministry, when they are somewhat advanced in life. Who can doubt this? Such men, when they become converted, may be encumbered with families, and it would be impossible for

them to spend five or seven years in a college, and they may be intelligent, well educated, practical men; indeed, they perhaps have acquired more knowledge and practical wisdom in their extensive intercourse with the world, than most students ever acquire at college. Is not one of the great ends, aimed at in college, to impart practical wisdom, to make us business men, to prepare us for the active duties of life? Now when a man of this kind becomes converted, and has a burning desire to preach the Gospel, is he to be cut off from all hopes of ever entering the ministry, merely because he was not converted in his youth? And yet such men are now virtually cut off. It is true, some such have entered our seminaries, and have been, and are now, among the most useful working men in our church, but they entered our present institutions, and pursued their studies under great discouragements. The general rule, in all our existing institutions is, that all who enter the theological department, must be well prepared in the sciences and the languages, and we think the rule a good one. Men, therefore, who have not the required literary attainments, are, of course, regarded as occupying an inferior position, and this is the very reason why they ought not to be there. It is, therefore, not at all the design of the founders of this Institute, in any way or manner, to reduce the standard of theological education, It is merely designed to furnish facilities for pious laymen, who may not have had the advantages of an early education, and who may not have been called to the work of the ministry until somewhat advanced in life. Here men of this description will not feel as much embarrassed, as they would at another school. The very existence of this Institution will exert a powerful influence upon the pious and talented laymen of our church. It will be a perpetual call to the ministry. Yes, there are scores of pious laymen scattered over our church, who have been converted in the numerous revivals that have recently visited our congregations; they have long been thinking of the ministry, and they have long since been convinced that the Lord has called them, but there seemed to be no way opened for them. In the Methodist, or Baptist church, they would long since have been brought out, and been burning and shining lights in the church. Now their objections will all be removed, and I have no doubt the Holy Spirit will direct many of them to this Institution. That passage of Paul, "Wo unto me if I preach not the Gospel," will now ring anew in their ears, and give them no rest until they consecrate



themselves to the work of the ministry. The old system of preparing men for the ministry in our church, would seem to take it for granted that none are called but young men. This of course we do not believe. God always has, and even now calls men to the work of the ministry at various ages. Look at the past history of the church. John Calvin was a lawyer, and somewhat advanced before he was brought under the influence of the truth, and gave himself to the work of the ministry. John Bunyan was not converted until after he became the head of a family, and although he was no classical scholar, yet who would question his usefulness and his theological attainments? Thousands of our most learned Divines might sit with profit at his feet and learn theology. Look too at John Newton, one of the sweetest singers in Israel; he was nearly fifty years old when he was called to the ministry; his early education was very limited; he never had more than two years education, and yet the good he accomplished, no human mind can compute. He was instrumental in the conversion of Claudius Buchanan, Thomas Scott, Leigh Richmond, Henry Martyn, Judson and Newell.—Look too at Andrew Fuller, who entered the ministry without any preparatory training, yet he became one of the most learned theologians of his own or any other age! Dr. James P. Wilson commenced his splendid career as an attorney, and yet reached a most prominent position in the Presbyterian church, as a theologian. Dr. Milnor, of precious memory, was also a member of the bar, and at the head of a family before he was called to the ministry, yet his praise is in all the churches. Yea, the history of the church is replete with illustrious examples of lawyers and physicians, merchants, farmers and mechanics, and even stage-actors, who in after life became converted, and entered upon the work of the ministry, and were eminently useful in the church. Why should it not be so again? For such this Institute opens her arms—such she invites. Is there anything wrong in this? Can those who think they can best glorify God by pursuing a different course, find fault with us?

It has been said by those who are not friendly to this Institution, that it must necessarily have a tendency to reduce the standard of education. Not at all. Has the missionary Institute at Basel, or the one at Creischona, still of a lower grade, or Gossner's Private School, still lower, had any such effect in Europe? The fact is, our Theological Seminaries can now elevate the standard of education, and will not



be compelled to abridge the regular course, in order to meet the wants of such men.

Although this Institution has been founded by Lutherans, and will be mainly supported by them, its doors will be opened to all, no matter with what churches the applicant may be connected. The Bible, and the Bible alone, will be the great text book of this Institution. We are, it is true, Lutherans, and we love the Lutheran church, and intend to labor for her prosperity while life endures; but we also love all God's people, and rejoice in the success of other evangelical denominations. We bid them "God speed" in the work of converting the world. We honor all churches. We thank God for the good they are doing, and we most cordially invite them to make use of this Institution, and to coöperate with us in the great mission of furnishing an evangelical ministry to meet the spiritual destitution that exists in the world.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

"IS IT RIGHT TO BAPTIZE THE CHILDREN OF PARENTS NOT IN CONNECTION WITH ANY CHRISTIAN SOCIETY?"

By Rev. Jonathan Oswald, A. M., York, Pa.

In discussing this question, two things are necessary:—first brevity, and secondly, some latitude—some things merely hinted at, or passed over in silence, which logically, on the general subject of Baptism, or Infant Baptism, ought to have a place; and some perhaps noticed, which would *seem* at first sight, not necessarily to belong to the subject.

The query at the head of this article, has exercised the minds of serious men in our connection, and therefore merits serious consideration; yet is it far too general and *indefinite*, as the framers of it would no doubt readily admit, upon mature reflection, to permit of anything but a, perhaps, rather discursive article, to cover the whole, if possible, and to reach the difficulty, or answer the question intended—"Is it right?" &c. We will take it for granted, that by "right" is here meant, *is it scriptural?* and this latter, rather than the former word, the inquirers should, in this instance, have employed. The great standard to which to appeal in such a case, must be the Bible. Whatever is in accordance with it,

or is sanctioned by it, is "*right*," and whatever wants this sanction, is *wrong*. Our creed is not what the best men say, nor what the most men say, nor what Synods decide, but what God has declared in his own blessed word, which is the test that never fails—the balance that has no deceit—the rule\* that has no crookedness—the Judge that decides all controversies.

Again, in reference to the indefiniteness of the question, "Is it right to baptize?" &c., I may observe that the term or phrase, "Christian society," does not seem to be sufficiently churchly, by which I mean *Scriptural*, and upon close scrutiny, it becomes a grave inquiry—what is here intended by it? what does it mean? I suppose it has no reference to the church of Christ, i. e., to the *church general*, of which also, at least in some sense, all merely baptized persons are members. But does it refer to some *particular* church, as the Presbyterian church, the German Reformed church, the Lutheran church, &c., or to some *one congregation*, of some *particular* church, or branch of the church general? I *suppose* the latter is intended, but if so, it would have been safest and best to have said so at once, or to have stated the question so clearly, that there could have been no *supposition* in the case.

Finally: "Is it right to baptize the children of parents not in connection with any Christian society?" Now "parents not in connection with any Christian society," *might* be:—

1. Worshipers of the Grand Lama, of Brahma, or of Jupiter and all the Gods—might be very heathen. It is not *probable*, indeed, that such will offer their children for Christian baptism, yet it is *possible*. From all that I have ever been able to learn concerning the Gipsies, though dwellers in England, in Spain, in France and in Germany, &c., yet have they never amalgamated with any of these nationalities, in blood, or adopted their customs, or *their religion*; but after the lapse of centuries, are *heathen still*; yet a gipsy once brought her child to me, to receive this rite of the New Testament church, which, of course, under the circumstances, was refused.

2. Parents not in connection with any "Christian society," *might* be Mohammedans, or unconverted Jews; and if such requested baptism for their offspring, under all ordinary circumstances, compliance with such petition could not so much even as be thought of.

3. Parents not in connection with any "Christian society," such as heathen, Mohammedans, Jews, and unbaptized unbelievers, might have children, who might providentially fall into the hands of Christians, (has this never occurred in the history of the church?) and whether such professors of the Christian religion, might not consecrate those children (so entrusted to them) to God in baptism, is a question which my feelings, I believe the usages, perhaps I should rather say the *spirit of our church*, would lead me to answer in the affirmative. Nay, I will go a step further. When God instituted the rite of circumcision in the family of Abraham, he said: "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, he who is not of thy posterity. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant."—Gen. 17: 10, 11, 12, 13. Now, if circumcision was the initiatory ordinance in the Old Testament church, as baptism is in the New, and if baptism has taken the place of circumcision, and they of the Abrahamic family were not only permitted, but *required* to circumcise those who came into their possession, though *not of their seed*, but Gentiles, heathen; then, too, are Christians under obligations the most solemn, to receive into the Christian church, children of whatever origin, whose bringing up, whose religious training is providentially and *solely* placed into their hands.

4. "Parents not in connection with any Christian society," may be, and in this country frequently are, such who were themselves baptized in infancy, and are, therefore, members of the church of Christ, i. e., of the church general, though not of a *particular* church, "Christian society" or congregation. Should such parents present their infant children for Christian baptism, is compliance with their request "right?" I answer in the affirmative, and I think by authority also, from that Book from which there is no appeal, especially if such parties consented, among other requirements, to embrace the earliest opportunity to do that which constitutes individuals members of *particular* churches and congregations, which

is, in fact and in effect, whatever the special forms and ceremonies, an agreement mutually made by Christians, to worship God together, in the same manner, and in accordance with the same principles; and to unite in the same fellowship and the same discipline.

But to proceed, baptism signifies in the sacred Scriptures, *suffering*. "But Jesus said unto them, ye know not what ye ask; can ye drink of the cup I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" "But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how I am straitened till it be accomplished."—Mark 10: 38; Luke 12: 50.

Again, baptism signifies investiture or endowment with the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."—Matt. 3: 11; see also Acts 11: 15.

Finally, though the words *Βαπτίζω* and *Βαπτισμα* have no necessary connection with water, yet is baptism with water a sacrament, or rite of the New Testament church. "And as they went on *their* way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, see, *here* is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."—Acts 8: 36, 37, 38. And again: "Can any man forbid WATER, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we."—Acts 10: 47. Baptism with water, is then a *reality*. It is a divine institution. This has been denied by several classes of men in the history of the church. "Persons who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, or the satisfaction of Christ, are, in a sense, constrained to deny baptism also, in order to preserve consistency in their opinions. The command to baptize in, or into, the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is a plain, unanswerable exhibition of the doctrine of the Trinity. The cleansing with water, also, is too unequivocal a symbol of our spiritual purification by the blood of Christ, to suffer any rational denial or doubt;" hence the marvel is not, that they who deny these important and essential doctrines, should deny also, but the wonder is that they should at all admit, the institution of baptism. But if there have been those who

have denied baptism, in the proper sense, to be a *divine institution*, there also have not been wanting those who perverted this ordinance from what its divine Author had constituted it. Instead of a beautiful initiatory ordinance, they have made it essentially regeneration, thus "proclaiming a heresy as deadly and as mischievous, in its consequences, as its correlative and sister heresy, transubstantiation: for the party who makes baptism with water regeneration, does with one sacrament what others, who make the bread and wine the literal body and blood of Christ, do with the other sacrament. The one ascribes to the water the virtues which belong to the Holy Ghost; the others pretend to change the bread and wine into the Deity and humanity of Jesus. Both equally pervert signs by turning them into substances, instead of holding them as signs of great and precious truths." When in the progress of her history, the church, in the fourth century, became triumphant throughout the Roman empire, she suffered more from imperial favor, than amid the blaze of burning fagots. In the intoxication of her outward prosperity, she laid aside her robe of victory, and put on the livery of Cæsar, and all the seeds of the predicted apostacy, sown broadcast by Satan in the days of persecution, quickly produced, under the patronage of the State, a most disastrous harvest; and it is remarkable, that the first development of this apostacy, manifested itself in the universal perversion of the sacrament of Baptism. Eusebius, of this (fourth) century, speaking of the church of his day, said: "It looked like the very image of the kingdom of Christ, and altogether more like a dream than a reality. What so many of the Lord's saints and confessors before our time desired to see, and saw not, and to hear, and heard not, that is now before our eyes. It was of us the prophet spake, 'the wilderness shall rejoice, and the solitary place blossom as the rose;' whereas the church was widowed and desolate, her children have now to exclaim to her, 'enlarge thy borders, the place is too strait.' The promise is now fulfilling, 'all thy children shall be taught of God, and great shall be the peace of thy children.'" But all this dream of glory was a grand mistake. It was indeed but a dream. The apostolic church was now becoming, to a great extent, apostate. Many of the elements of popery were in full activity, and their first manifestations were in reference to baptism. Cyril, eminent in the church of that day, defines it thus: "Baptism is the ransom to cap-

tives, the remission of offences, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, the garment of light, the chariot to heaven, the luxury of paradise, the gift of adoption." New and superstitious rites were now added to it, and such, it is said, "was the universal confidence in the regenerative efficacy of this sacrament, *ex opere operato*, that vast numbers of converts, in order to enjoy the world as long as they could, delayed it to the hour and agony of death, and then were baptized as their passport to heaven. Among others was Constantine, as is shown by a medal with the relieve of that illustrious personage, bearing the inscription, 'NATUS BAPTIZATUS'; that is, born again by baptism. In fact, this beautiful initiatory ordinance had ceased to be what its Divine Author had constituted it, and instead, it had been caricatured into an amulet, an exorcism, a potent chemical drug that served as an antidote to sin, and a specific for regeneration." Milner, the historian, speaking of this century, says: "There was much outward religion, but the true doctrine of justification was scarcely seen; and real conversion was very much lost, and external baptism placed in its stead."

The question, however, at the head of this article, is, we may say in general, an inquiry after the *proper subjects* of baptism. We mean not, that the query itself is general, for it is not, (i. e., in intent, though far too indefinite in fact, as already shown) but our observation, and to meet the specific end proposed by the inquiry, we remark generally:

1. That all those who believe in Jesus-Christ, and openly or publicly profess their faith in his name, are proper subjects for baptism. This, we apprehend, no one who receives the Bible, or acknowledges it as the word of God, will deny, but as not essential to the main inquiry, we dismiss it, without further consideration, and proceed to observe:

2. That the children of believers are Scriptural subjects for baptism. Inasmuch, however, as this is not the specific subject of inquiry, it might properly have been left altogether unnoticed in this place, but for one consideration, as we shall see presently, or if noticed, but for this one thing, it might have been dismissed with the single remark, that the infant children of believers should be baptized—"Quia liberi Christianorum fœderis gratiæ sunt participes, et ideo signis et sigillis hujus fœderis a liberis infidelium sunt distinguendi, et quia olim infantes mares Judæorum circumcidebantur; etiam baptismus, qui in circumcisionis locum successit, infantibus Christianorum non est denegandus." The one

consideration which required a notice of this point, and which renders its summary dismissal improper, is derived from the fact, that it is *essential* to make good this position as preliminary to the main inquiry. Assuredly, if the infant children of believers may not be offered, or consecrated to the Triune God in this holy sacrament, then must we indeed look for proper subjects for baptism among infants in vain.

In support of the duty of baptizing children, (of course, we here mean, the infant children of Christian parents) the following reasons have been justly urged: that it is reasonable in itself, and in accordance with our best affections; that the analogy of God's dealings in past ages, is in favor of the doctrine of infant baptism. In all the covenants which God made with men, children were always connected with their parents. Thus it was with the covenants with Adam, with Noah, with Abraham and with David. God dealt favorably with the children of Lot, for their father's sake; and he declares himself a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that hate him, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love him and keep his commandments. It is most unlikely then, that God, in the Christian church, has departed from the invariable economy of his dealings, and sundered the connection between parents and their children. Blessed be God, that in spite of Anabaptists and Antipædobaptists, (Baptists improperly so called) believing parents may consecrate their offspring to God in this holy ordinance, with the hope that living, they may in mature years be found of God, like Noah, just and perfect in their generation, or that, if like buds, they prematurely wither from their mother's bosom, they may meet them again in the New Jerusalem, amid the glories of the new heaven, and on the new earth, in whose habitations shall be no death, on whose winds shall be borne no sound of weeping, and in whose acres shall be no graves.

But though it is no part of our purpose, in this place, to argue this point specially for its own sake, yet we cannot in justice withhold the testimony of history having a bearing on this subject. Justin, who wrote about forty years after the death of the apostle John, says: "We have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision; and we have received it by baptism." The Christian fathers considered baptism as having come in the place of circumcision, and such it would appear, from the quotation above made, must have been the opinion of Justin. The testimony of the



peaceful Irenæus, the great advocate of peace in a world of conflict, is, that "Christ came to save all persons who by him are baptized unto God, *infants*, and *little ones*, and children, and youths, and elder persons." Tertullian, who was contemporary with Irenæus, although he advises to delay baptism in the case of infants and unmarried persons, yet speaks most expressly of infant baptism as a prevailing and established practice. Origen, who was born within eighty-five years of the death of John, and was descended from Christian ancestors who must have lived in the apostolic age, speaks repeatedly and expressly of infant baptism, and declares that the practice had come down from the apostles. Subsequent to this period, infant baptism is mentioned often, and in the most positive terms, by all the principal Christian fathers, as Cyprian, Optatus, Basil, Gregory, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine. It is recognized in the acts of councils, as well as in the writings of individuals. It is represented as resting on apostolic example and authority. Indeed, the right of infants to baptism, was denied by no one in the primitive church, except those who rejected water baptism altogether. Pelagius, in his controversy with Augustine, had strong inducements to deny it; so strong, that he was reported by some to have done so; but he repels the charge as an injurious slander. "Men slander me," says he, "as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants." "I never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants." Dr. Wall, who has so thoroughly investigated the history of infant baptism, as to leave little to be done by those who come after him, assures us that the first body of men, of which he can find any account, who denied baptism to infants, were the Petrobrusians, a sect of the Albigenses, in the former part of the twelfth century.—And Milner says that "a few instances excepted, the existence of Anti-pedobaptism seems scarcely to have a place in the church of Christ, till a little after the beginning of the Reformation."

We have catalogues extant of all the different sects of professing Christians in the first four centuries—the very period in which infant baptism must have been introduced, if it were not of divine original—in all which, the differences of opinion which obtained in those times respecting baptism, are particularly recounted and minutely designated. Yet there is no mention of any, except those who denied water baptism altogether, who did not consider infant baptism as a divine

institution. Is it not certain, then, that infant baptism is a divine institution; that it is not an innovation, but was sanctioned by the apostles themselves? On this ground, and this only, all sacred and profane history, relating to the subject, appears plain and consistent, from Abraham to Christ, and from Christ to this day."

Having said thus much in reference to the proper subjects of Christian baptism, as preliminary to the main inquiry, I now remark:

3. *That infant baptism is, in the sacred Scriptures, confined to the children of believers, or of professing Christians alone*, which parents, of course, belong to the church general by baptism, and must almost necessarily be supposed to be in connection with some particular church, as heretofore defined, and also with some congregation, or "*Christian society*." This position, I apprehend, covers, or is a sufficient answer to the question at the head of this article; and this, I maintain as alone true, "right" or Scriptural. The two exceptions to this, (as some might be disposed to call them) which I heretofore made, are not exceptions in fact, whatever they might seem to the cursory reader, for, in the one case, the parents do already belong to the church general by baptism, and enter into solemn covenant to observe all *special* requirements, and in the other case, it is *supposed* that God has *providentially* placed the children of aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, into the hands of Christians, and thus given them *these* in the *stead* of their natural parents. Is not this a fairly supposable case? May it not happen? Has it not often occurred in the history of the church? The *exposed* children with whom, as is well known, pagan barbarism was formerly accustomed to people its *ergastula*, its schools of gladiators, its places of prostitution, but with whom the church, in her charity, recruited the fold of Jesus Christ; whom she nourished, fed, clothed and educated, and brought up to a trade, and *instructed in the faith*, is it to be thought for a moment, that these whom the church adopted, for whom she did all else, were left like their heathen ancestry, unbaptized? Nay more, does not the church, even at this day, establish herself most firmly among the heathen, by this kind of proselytism, the most honorable of all? It is said, that the missionaries, in the different heathen countries, especially in China, are chiefly engaged in seeking out and bringing up exposed children, and unless they be of those who deny infant baptism altogether, is it probable that they refuse to these the initia-

tory rite of the New Testament church? When such children are separated from their former connections, and *adopted* by individual Christians, or by the church, they are *ipso facto*, no longer strangers to the covenants of promise, but the children of the church and of believers, (by adoption) and hence, that which at first sight might seem an exception to the position which I have laid down, ought not, I think, neither in letter nor in spirit, be regarded as an exception at all. But to proceed; the visible church, both under the Old and New Testament dispensation, is substantially the same. It holds essentially the same doctrines, enjoys the same spiritual promises, and professes the same religion—the religion of the Bible, and hence children must be considered in the same light, under both dispensations, unless the Scriptures have changed the state of their relations and privileges, which they have not. All in the Abrahamic church, i. e., the males, were circumcised; all made a public profession of religion, entered publicly into covenant with God, and all partook regularly of the Passover, and hence the children of every Israelite were the children of a professor of religion, and as such, received the initiatory seal of the covenant of grace. But as none but the children of such as publicly professed the religion of the Scriptures, could lawfully receive this seal under the Old dispensation, it is manifest that no children but such as these, can lawfully receive baptism under the New or Christian dispensation, unless an alteration has been made with respect to this subject, which cannot be shown.

Again, this view of the subject, viz: that infant baptism is confined in Scripture, to the offspring of professing Christians alone, is sustained by the declaration of Peter to the Jews. “The promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”—Acts 2: 39. “Those who were *afar off*, were Gentiles; as St. Paul has taught us, Eph. 2: 17. *Christ came, says the apostle, and preached peace to you, who were afar off, and to them that were nigh*; that is, to the Ephesians, and other Gentiles, and to the Jews. *The promise*, St. Peter informs us, is to as *many* of these Gentiles, as the Lord our God shall call. That it is to them in the same manner, and on the same terms, as to the Jews, is decisively concluded; because neither St. Peter, nor any other Scriptural writer, specifies any difference. The scions of the wild olive, St. Paul informs us, were grafted on the good olive, where they

grew, and partook of the fatness of the root, in exactly the same manner as if they had been the natural branches. The terms, it is to be remembered, are the same: and the promise conveys no more, as well as no less, to the Gentiles than to the Jews; unless the alteration is declared. Such children, then, among the Gentiles, as are born of those who profess the religion of the Scriptures, are included in the covenant, and are to be baptized. But the warrant extends to no others."

Again, the view which we are now taking of this subject, viz: that the children of believing, or of professing Christian parents, *alone may be baptized, and no others*, is clearly taught or set forth by the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 1: 14. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy," i. e., they may be offered to God, but there is no other mode of offering children to God in the Christian church, than by baptism, and hence the children of believers may be baptized; baptized if but one of the parents, either the father or the mother be a Christian, *but certainly excluded from receiving this seal of the covenant of grace, if both parents are unbelievers.*

Finally: the circumstance related by Matthew, "Then there were brought unto him little children, that he should put *his* hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. and he laid *his* hands on them, and departed thence."—Matt. 19: 13, 14, 15. See also Mark 10: 14, and Luke 18: 16. This circumstance, i. e., the saying of the Master, "suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me," rightly understood, cannot be taken as a warrant to *baptize children promiscuously*, without reference to the parental condition and relation to Christ and to his church. These parents were *professors of religion*; they were such certainly as Jews, and from their conduct, we infer that they were believers also in the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. It has, moreover, been justly remarked by another, that Christ, when he opposes the conduct of his disciples, who would have hindered these children from being brought to him, says, not, "suffer little children," but "suffer the little children" to come unto me, and forbid them not. The words in all the three Evangelists, who have recorded this story, are τὰ παιδία, *the little children*; and cannot be pleaded as a warrant for bringing to

Christ in baptism, any other children than such as are in like circumstances with those mentioned in this passage.

Such, then, are our views on this subject, and which we regard as alone "right" or Scriptural. I am aware that they differ from those of not a few learned and pious men, both in the ministry and out of the ministry, who maintain that children may be baptized in their own right, without respect to their parental relation, and under the general commission of Christ: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," (Matt. 28: 19,) or, who requiring a profession of religion from the parents before baptizing their children, yet "*neither require nor expect them to partake of the Lord's Supper.*" Now in *disregarding their parental relation* in the baptism of children, these do that which God does not do, who declared himself a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children; unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate him; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love him and keep his commandments, and in exacting a partial obedience from parents to the requirements of Christianity, i. e., to make a profession of religion before baptizing their children, and yet neither requiring nor expecting obedience from such parents to the Savior's command, "This do in remembrance of me," is teaching parents "that there is a distinction between the qualifications which, in the view of the Scriptures, are necessary to warrant us to offer up our children in baptism, and those which are necessary to make us lawfully communicants at the table of Christ." But it cannot be shown that such a distinction is found in the Scriptures, and therefore, should not be made, because unwarranted, and fraught with danger, as are all practices not sanctioned by that Book which decides all disputes, and discloses all responsibilities.

In conclusion, I will yet say, that baptism is an outward ordinance. It is an ordinance which has been grossly perverted, and thus made to serve as an antidote to sin, and a specific to regeneration. External baptism has been placed in the stead of real conversion. However, theirs is the sin, and theirs alone, who have been guilty of such perversion. It is possible to be baptized by man, and yet be unbaptized by God; to have the baptism with water; and yet be destitute of that inner baptism which alone qualifies for admission into the New Jerusalem, in which the *blood-washed* will walk, guided unerringly and ever by the beams of that glory which

originally dwelt between the Cherubim; no longer the monopoly of one nation and of a few people, but of a great multitude which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, who shall stand before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and with palms in their hands—the emblems of purity and of victory.

Finally, though water baptism is an outward ordinance, yet is it of great meaning or import. I like the answer to the question in our Catechism, "What does such water baptism signify?" "It signifies, that the old Adam, with all sinful lusts and affections, should be drowned and destroyed by daily sorrow and repentance; and that a new man should daily arise, that shall dwell in the presence of God in righteousness and purity forever." And again, though many have had their baptismal name written in the register of the church on earth, and not in those of the church in heaven, because of their disobedience to the vows of God which were upon them, yet so important do I esteem this *baptism with water*, that I really cannot understand how those who either despise or wilfully neglect it, *can be saved*. Certain it is, that they who shall stand on the banks of the river of life, whose pure waters no wintry frosts shall bind, nor sultry suns deprive of their freshness, are all the *friends* of Jesus Christ. But the friends of Christ are already known on earth, by their obedience. This is the Master's test: "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you."—John 15: 14. Baptism, however, is an ordination of Christ, and to despise it, is *hostility* to the Savior; yea, even to *neglect it*, must be accounted *hostility* here, where there *can* be no neutrality, and hence these all will be crushed with the enemies of Christ. With the *obedient*, with his friends, how may we hope that such shall ever sit beneath the shadow of the tree, called the tree of life, where every pulse of every heart is worship, and every breath as the morning incense? The connection between time and the great eternity which is perpetually thundering at our door, is most intimate. The former ultimately, so far as we are concerned, mingles with, passes over into, is swallowed up of the latter, and yet for us preserves its identity, its independence and its amazing relative importance. It is the twilight of the *eternal day*, or of the *everlasting night*. Friends of the Mediator now, friends forever! Enemies now, enemies forever! The works (obedience to Christ)

of Christians follow them, and they are at rest, and are blessed. The sins of the wicked (disobedience to Christ) which flowed from their unregenerate and unsanctified hearts in time, like streams of evil, will flow after them into eternity, and constitute that dead, and deep, and ever moaning sea of ill, which we call Hell.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE RELATION OF THE FAMILY TO THE CHURCH.

By Rev. M. Valentine. A. M., Middletown, Pa.

Few Christian duties are so sadly neglected as family training. This neglect is becoming the curse of the church. It is scattering her infant membership among the ranks of the world, and delivering over to the bondage of sin, multitudes that ought to be crowding around the altar of Christ. It is a blighting evil. It is especially prevalent in our day. In passing through our churches, the discovery is soon made, that family nurture is either entirely neglected, or attended to in such a manner as but to insure its own defeat. An injurious error has stolen into the minds of Christians, and the wrong practice grows out of wrong notions. The error amounts to a practical denial of both the church membership of the offspring of believers, and the divinely appointed relation of family nurture to the formation of Christian character. It first takes away the privileges of the covenant from the children of Christians, and then turns "the nurture and admonition of the Lord," appointed for their culture, into a mere formal training, or none at all. that leaves them just where the training of the world would—in sin. We are surrounded by sects that either reject infant membership from their creed, or, accepting it, adopt a theory of conversion which entirely nullifies the significance of the church relation of their children. The principle of those who would surrender their offspring wholly to the uncovenanted mercies of God, and, in withholding the baptismal seal from them, deny them any more church connection than a Pagan child sustains, is but little worse than the practice of others, more numerous, who give them the seal, and then, instead of training them



as church members, and under covenant grace, expecting the development of a Christian character, rear them, undistinguished from the spirit of the world, only for future conversion. This system makes Christians look for nothing from their children, until they become adults. It makes them leave them as without remedy until that time; only hoping and praying that then, their depravity and sinful habits, strengthened by years of neglected training, will be suddenly overmastered and reversed by some mighty spiritual conversion. Any one can see, that this practice puts the children of the church and the children of the world on precisely the same ground; both subject to the same spiritual agencies; both to be reclaimed in the same way. What is this but to deny the benefit of the covenant, and make it amount to nothing? The sentiment and practice of many in the Lutheran church have taken complexion from the presence of these surrounding errors. Their children are not brought forward for baptism; or if baptized, their church connection is regarded as only a nominal thing, with no divine significance or vital power. They are not expected to grow up Christians, and of course, by a clear relation of cause and effect, they do not. The essence of the whole mistake consists in denying or overlooking this simple truth: *That by virtue of God's everlasting covenant with his people, their children are born members of the church, and are to be treated as such.*

The object proposed in this article is, from a review of the covenant relation of the believer's offspring to the church, to deduce the divinely intended meaning and force of Christian family nurture.

The family and the church are the two permanent facts in the world, most closely related to the good of our race. Both are divine institutions. They owe their origin, not to human arrangement, but to divine enactment. They are organic constitutions framed by God. The family has come down to us from Eden. God set the race in families from the beginning. The Savior refers to the creation of man as male and female, as looking directly to the formation and perpetuity of the family constitution. It is a relation by itself, with its own laws and powers. It has its own moral mission to fulfil, and God has organized it with the moral forces competent to its accomplishment. What are the divine designs in the family? Evidently the moral and spiritual culture of the race, as well as its perpetuation. To restrict its object to the latter, would be wholly unworthy of the high place which God

has assigned it in his word, and the heavenly care with which its sanctity is guarded. Had man not fallen, doubtless a sinless nature would have been forever transmitted through the family bond. Originally, there was a unity in the force of the family life and influence, which would have reproduced the same spotlessly innocent character with which Adam and Eve came from the Creator's hand. As man is fallen, a depraved nature is perpetuated. So uniform and powerful is the operation of this law, that no exception to its result ever occurs. But the family has still its spiritual design. The second Adam has come for the restoration of the race. The agency for restoration evidently contemplates the employment of this original divine institution. Though its efficacy cannot prevent depravity, it has some relation to its correction. The family still stands for the object of moral culture. The remedial means have been thrown into the channel that had been perverted to sin, and the blessing may overmaster the curse.

The church, too, has its divine object. It is the pillar and ground of revealed truth, and has been organized for the salvation of the world. It is the depository of the agencies that have been given for the removal of the curse of sin and the conquest of men to the control of Jesus Christ. Its mission looks to the accomplishment of the entire purpose of God's mercy toward our fallen race. It sends its influence, therefore, through many channels. It is the ultimate divine organization, itself "alive unto God," from which a vital power is to go forth for the reconstruction of humanity, and the eternal salvation of souls. The church, therefore, which is the later constitution, is a new power brought into requisition, to conspire with the family for the accomplishment of moral and spiritual ends. The former was not intended to set aside the moral mission of the latter, but to throw into it greater efficiency, by its presence and coöperation. The current of grace flows from the church into the family. The domestic constitution does not lose its spiritual object by the ecclesiastical constitution, but is gifted with fresh power for its attainment.

The Scriptures settle the fact that the church of God is *one*, in all ages; the one body of the one living Head. It has been developed through different dispensations; but whatever changes have been made, have left untouched the essential integrity of the original institution. It carries with it, therefore, forever, the essential principles divinely inwrought

into its first organization. They cannot be repealed until God repeals them.

I. We are concerned now with one of these first principles. This is *infant membership in the church of God.*

1. There can be no denial of this, in the church under the Old Testament dispensation. It is as clear as light. Entrance into the church by parents, was the entrance of their children into the same connection. In the first formal establishment of the church, God included the family. *His covenant with his people is a family covenant.* To Abraham, God said, "*I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.*"—Gen. 17: 7. The apostles again and again refer to this covenant as lying at the foundation of the Jewish church. See Gal. 3: 17, and Acts 3: 9. The seal of the covenant was added: "*Every male child among you shall be circumcised.*" "*He that is eight days old shall be circumcised.*" "*And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.*" This "sign of circumcision," Paul tells us, was "*a seal of the righteousness of faith.*"—Rom. 4: 11. Two features of this transaction cannot be misunderstood: First, that God embraced children in the terms of his first covenant with his church: and secondly, that circumcision was the appointed recognition of their church relation. The covenant plainly took the family as *one*, and in receiving the parents, received the children. It applied to them all, the "seal of the righteousness of faith." No difficulty was raised on the ground that infants could have no faith. Faith then, as now, was the living power of the church. It was the essential life of piety. Without it, it was impossible to please God. It was a truth then, as it now is, and shall be, until all the church militant shall enter the church triumphant, that "*the just shall live by faith.*" Yet, of this very principle of spiritual life, was circumcision the sign and seal to infants. But how was this? Plainly, that from the divinely constituted oneness of the family bond, the faith of parents was taken for the faith of their children. Faith may have been a necessary prerequisite to the administration of the rite, but the parental faith stood for that of the family. The offspring were at once viewed as believers, because their moral life was as yet embraced in the moral life

of their parents, and subject to their formative influence. And thus they were "sealed" to God from their birth. There seems to have been no thought that, perhaps, the children, having reached responsible life, would not choose the faith of their fathers. The family, worshiping at one altar, and formed in the nurture of one spiritual life, was regarded as a permanent part of the church of God.

The thing to be noticed here, and carried on the memory in this whole discussion, as essential to a right view of the subject, is, that the children were not constituted members of the church by the rite of circumcision, but were born in the church. They were members by the provisions of the covenant. This relation was only acknowledged by their circumcision. The rite is expressly declared to have been a "sign" and "seal." It was not initiatory. It was but the recognition of a relation formed by the prior force of the covenant. The declaration of God, that should any one not receive this seal, "That soul should be cut off from his people," is decisive on this point. There must have been church connection, independently of circumcision. Else, how could there have been any "cutting off?" How else could it have been said of the non-circumcised, "he hath broken my covenant." God appears to have viewed his covenant with the children of his church as peculiarly sacred, and to have enforced its acknowledgment under the sanction of a heavy curse. Circumcision was not the covenant itself, but the appointed sign and seal of it, for that dispensation of the church. It did not confer membership—only publicly acknowledged a relation formed by virtue of God's "everlasting covenant"—infant membership in his church.

2. This feature is distinctly carried forward in the New Testament church. Jesus Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil the covenant. "He was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promise made to the fathers."—Rom. 5: 8. "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."—Gal. 3: 29. We naturally look for the continuance of this first divinely instituted relation of children to the church. Accordingly, the Redeemer is seen taking "little children" and holding them forth as the highest examples of fitness for church connection under the New dispensation; "of such is the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. 19: 14. And amid the wonderful scenes of the day of Pentecost, when the church was planting itself afresh on the eternal foundation, under the glow,

and fervor, and inspiration from the descending baptism of the Holy Ghost, the joyous principle was reannounced in all the fulness of its pristine glory: "*The promise is unto you and to your children.*"—Acts 2: 39. The perpetuation of this divine arrangement was unequivocally affirmed. There was no narrowing of the stream of the blessings of the covenant. The principle of infant membership was sent forward as a permanent feature of the church of Jesus Christ. But we must examine this more minutely.

There is no need of proof that, in the continuance of the promise under the evangelical dispensation, baptism has taken the place of circumcision. Circumcision, as but an outward appendage, as a seal of the covenant, could be made to give place to another form, and yet leave the promise in full force. "The forms of dispensation effect not the substance of the thing dispensed." The former seal is abolished, but a new one stands as a holy ordinance in the constitution of the Christian church. See, Peter puts the proposition clearly thus: "Because the promise is to you and your children,"—"repent and be baptized every one of you."—Acts 2: 38, 39. In accordance with this, the apostles administered baptism as the seal of the covenant, to whole households. Look also at the language of Paul to the Colossians, in which he makes Christian circumcision, "the circumcision of Christ," equivalent to being "buried with him in baptism."—Chap. 2: 11, 12. There can be no doubt that baptism is the divine "sign and seal of the righteousness of faith," under the Christian dispensation. As such, it is the birthright of the children of believers.

This view of the subject has, in its main features, passed into the creed of nearly all orthodox Christendom. Its correctness has been attested by the concurring arguments of the ablest theologians.

The Augsburg Confession teaches, "that children ought to be baptized, who through baptism are offered to God and received into his favor."—Art. 9.

"It is certain that the promise of salvation belongs also to children. But it does not belong to those who are without the church of Christ, where the word and sacraments are not, because the kingdom of Christ exists only in union with the word and sacraments."—Apol. Conf., Art. 9.

The Smalcald Articles reiterate the same doctrine: "We teach that infants ought to be baptized. For they have a right to the promise of redemption effected through Christ.

And the church owes them baptism and the announcement of that promise."—Art 5.

These extracts clearly show the position our church has taken on this subject. Almost numberless passages might be added from our theological writers, asserting its Scriptural correctness. Let several suffice. *Gerhard* says: "When parents consecrate themselves to Christ, their children are also to be baptized and brought to him."—*Loci*, Tom. IX. Cap. 8, p. 234.

"Whoever is a partaker of the covenant of grace, must be entitled to baptism; and as children are partakers of the covenant, they ought to be baptized."—*Hunnius' Epit. Cred.* 646.

The plea that faith is an indispensable prerequisite to the administration of baptism, weighs not a grain more against its application to infants, than a similar objection would have done against the performance of circumcision on the "eighth day." We are distinctly taught that that was "a seal of faith," as truly as baptism is. It would have been mad absurdity in the Jew, to resist the ordinance of God, because he could not understand how the circumcised child could exercise faith. The reason that would now exclude it from baptism, would then have excluded it from circumcision. The whole question of the possibility of infant faith, is foreign to the prior question of the infant's right to the ordinance. The right flows from the terms of the covenant. And when the divine plan is declared, every objection should feel itself hushed to silence. But there *is* faith when the believer's child is baptized; if not in the child, yet in the parents. Its moral life is yet held in theirs; its faith is involved in theirs; it goes with the family bond. It is presumptively a believer, because its parents are really believers. There is no need to individualize all the members of the family—shatter, and drive apart into isolated units, the group about the domestic altar. God himself has made the family a constitutional whole, with its own peculiar relations and laws. In his covenant, he has taken the family together, and wrapped up the children in the faith of the parents. The whole household are under the covenant, and this is enough to demand the application of the "seal" of the common faith to all.

It is necessary to carry forward the principle so manifestly true under the former dispensation, that the offspring of Christians are *born* in the church. From this particular point, there is some dissent. Some hold that prior to baptism,

they are not within the church, and that this ordinance is their initiation. But what is this, but to abandon the main ground on which we plead for infant membership in the New Testament church; the permanence and force of the unrepented covenant? What constituted Jewish children members of the church? It was not circumcision. Non-circumcision could only result in their being "*cut off*" from a connection made by an anterior power. And what now constitutes them members? Evidently not baptism—the substituted seal—but the same covenant that then formed the relation. The only warrant for their membership now, is that unrepented divine covenant that placed them in the church *at birth*, and added then a visible seal of the relation. If we deny the continuance of this divine constitution, do we not cut ourselves off from all right to administer to them the ordinance of baptism?

*Gerhard*, though he calls baptism a rite of initiation, employs the following language: "In respect to original sin, all children are equal; yet there remains this difference, that some are born in the bosom and limits of the church, (*in ecclesiae gremio et pœniis*) but others, without the church. To the former belongs the promise, 'I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee.'—Gen. 17: 7. The latter are *unclean*.—1 Cor. 7: 14. The former have a right to baptism in infancy: to the latter, while neither they nor their parents embrace Christ, belongs neither the promise of God, nor the covenant of grace, nor baptism. They are *strangers from the covenant of promise*."—Eph. 2: 12. Rom. 9. p. 251.

*Calvin* maintained the birthright of the children of believing parentage in decided terms. "Children have need of baptism, not as a necessary aid to salvation, but to seal to them the grace of adoption. For Paul says that the children of believers are 'holy.'—1 Cor. 7: 14. They are not made children of God by baptism, but the church admits them to baptism, because they are heirs of the promise." Quoted by *Gerhard*. In his "*Institutes*" he says that it is not to be thought that "in baptism, the children of believers are transferred from place without, to one within the church."—Libr. 4. Cap. 15. And again, "Children sprung from a Christian parentage, are at once, and by birth, heirs of the covenant."—Cap. 16. *Beza* uses even stronger language than this. But it is needless to multiply quotations. These show the view to be brought out. Passages of the same import might



be gathered from various standard authors. Several facts put the correctness of this view beyond doubt.

First, the Gospel dispensation is an *unfolding*—not a *restriction*—of God's covenant with his church. This is indispensable. No reader of the New Testament can fail to see that it is a revelation of clearer and more comprehensive mercy; a freer outflowing of divine goodness to his church. The whole order of the divine manifestation has ever been from less to greater displays of mercy. "Each succeeding dispensation has comprehended the whole mass of benefits which belonged to the preceding, and added others of its own." The Gospel is the brightest display of God's love; the full stream into which grace has thrown the most lavish blessings that Heaven has for our race. We cannot but feel that, if any former ministration was "glorious," this is "more glorious." Would it not be in direct conflict with this manifest characteristic of the Gospel, to suppose that it abridges the covenant privileges of the children of the faithful? Is it to be believed that, though under the former economy they were born *in* the church, they are now, under the Gospel—the expanded glory of the covenant—born *outside* of it? Is it to be believed that in that very manifestation of enlarged mercy which brought "the blessing of Abraham on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ," (Gal. 3: 14) one of the most precious of "the blessings of Abraham," the birthright of children, should be withdrawn from the whole church? The stream of blessings had always flowed through pious parents to their offspring, and not one word of legitimate proof can be given from the New Testament, that the Gospel has thrown an impassable obstruction across that divinely appointed channel.

Again, we have no intimation that the Jews ever felt that the teachings of the apostles on this subject, would restrict their covenant privileges. This is an important fact. Evidently they, at once, understood the declaration of Peter, "The promise is unto you and to your children," as an assurance that in yielding to the Gospel, the former rule would still hold in reference to their offspring. The proof that they did so understand it, is, that they never uttered one objection on this point. They clung with an unyielding tenacity to all the peculiarities of their ecclesiastical constitution, and would never, without a fierce conflict, have consented to an arrangement that thrust out their little ones from their place in the church. Yet not a word of dissatisfaction, on this ground, can be found in the records of the New Testament. The

unbelieving Jews were watching with sleepless eyes, for matters of accusation against the Gospel. They haunted the steps of the apostles, and sought for pretexts to inflame the passions of the narrow-minded multitude against them. They cavilled at even the minutest departures from accustomed principles. But could anything have prompted louder clamor, or led to heavier charges, than an attempt to overturn a fundamental principle of the covenant with Abraham? Had such an attempt been made, is it to be conceived that Pharisaic hatred would not have made it the rallying point of opposition to the Gospel? But among all the objections that were so pertinaciously urged, no whisper of dissatisfaction is heard on this subject. Is not this fact conclusive proof that it was then an undisputed point, that the children of professing parents held, under the new economy, the same place and relation that were theirs under the old?

Further, Paul has actually decided this question in 1 Cor. 7: 14. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." What is the "holiness" here referred to? Certainly not an internal purity of heart, as though the children of Christians were born undepraved. It is an "*ecclesiastical holiness*." "Holy" is evidently used by the apostles in the sense of "consecrated," and in opposition to the term "unclean," or "common." In Lev. 20: 26, we have an expression that explains the use of the word: "Ye shall be *holy* unto me; for I the Lord am holy, and *have severed you from other people, that ye should be mine*." To be "holy," was to belong to the church. The apostle, therefore, unequivocally asserts the church membership of infants born of a believing parent. Look at the facts of this case. When only one of the parents was a believer, the question arose as to the relation of the children. Did the character of the unbelieving parent vitiate their covenant privilege, or the character of the believing one secure it? "Children descended from a half Jewish marriage were treated as true Jews." And Paul at once decides that the same rule is in force under the Gospel. "The good is stronger than the evil," and God, in overflowing grace, conveys, through even one believing parent, the mercies of his covenant. This passage is decisive as to the view held in the apostolic church. Had they believed that *no* children belonged to the church, there never could have been any question about the relation of those sprung from half Christian

parentage. "If the faith of *both* parents could not confer upon a child the privilege of membership, the faith of only *one* of them certainly could not."—Mason's Works, Vol. II. p. 381. The undisputed prerogative of the offspring of Christian parents, alone could have allowed any doubt in the case. "Thus," concludes Dr. Mason, "*the origin of this difficulty, on the one hand, and the solution of it on the other, concur in establishing our doctrine, that by the appointment of God himself, the infants of believing parents are born members of his church.*"—Vol. III. p. 382.

This doctrine throws a clear light on the meaning of baptism, as applied to infants. The ordinance, with them, is not initiatory. It does not form their church relation, but acknowledges it. It is the "seal" of the covenant which God has made with them. It is the church's recognition of their relation, and the beginning of the application of divinely appointed agencies for their spiritual welfare. They are looked upon, in the divine plan, as presumptively Christians, and are "sealed" as such, because their relation to agencies divinely appointed and competent to the end, contemplates the development of Christian character in them.

May not this discussion also help to decide a question that often comes up in ministerial experience—"Whether baptism ought to be administered to children, neither of whose parents is a professing Christian?" If the membership of children grows out of their relation to the covenant of God and their birth from Christian parentage—if the ordinance is not initiatory, but a "seal" of that covenant, what right can we have to apply it to those that are palpably without its range? The covenant is particular; it is the main foundation we have for infant baptism; can the ordinance apply beyond the limitations prescribed? Must we not proceed without warrant, whenever we go beyond them? Do we not, in such a case, abandon, in the very act of baptism, the very foundation that we ourselves claim for its administration on children? We rest the entire claim for infant membership in the church, on the force and perpetuity of the covenant; but we certainly cannot plead that covenant, in acting with the children of unbelievers.

From this review of the actual church membership of the children of the pious, we are prepared to advance to the second range of discussion proposed:

## II. The divinely intended meaning and force of Christian family nurture.

1. We have reached the truth, that children enter the Christian family and the Christian church, at the same time. What is the meaning of this fact? Clearly that they are to grow up as Christians. Else, would God have placed them within his church? He looks on them as his own; surely, not simply because they *ought* to become Christians, but because his plan contemplates their actually becoming such. Is it not clearly demonstrable, that the divine arrangement looks on the Christian family as a perpetual acquisition to the church; as not to revert in its subsequent expansion to the domain of the "world?" There seems to be a "law of population" within the church, for its own enlargement and growth; a law that looks to the retention of all the children that God has given it. The church is to grow in two ways; by keeping all its own, and by winning from the world. That God, therefore, has placed children in his church, implies that he has provided means for their development in Christian character. This means is found mainly in family nurture. Not that the spiritual power of the church does not reach them. The church reaches them, as children, through the family constitution; the same constitution through which they are connected with the church. The spiritual life which the family receives from the church, is to mould and form their moral character. This is the agency that is to "train them up in the way they should go." Amid the formative influences of the family piety, under "*the nurture and admonition of the Lord*," (Eph. 6: 4) made effectual by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost, they are to be transformed from sin, and set forward in life as Christian men. This is clearly the design of family nurture, in regard to the infant membership of the church. About the family altar are to be formed Christians for the sanctuary altar. To the parents, God says, "Take this child and train it for me; I have graciously made it a member of my church, and look for you to employ faithfully the means I have ordained, to develop in it a life and character correspondent with its position."

2. The agency appointed is competent to its work. This truth is to be sustained; and in maintaining it, the notion is not for a moment entertained, that those born in the church are not depraved, as others are. Nor is it supposed that any

simple culture of their fallen nature can make it bud and blossom with spiritual life, and bear the fruitage of piety. "The production of a holy character, under the most favorable circumstances, evinces the operation of the divine energy; for its existence is a triumph over antagonistic powers in man himself." It is the energy of the Holy Ghost that reconstructs the fallen powers of the soul, and turns their activities toward God. But it is to be remembered, that the Spirit can as easily renew a child through an appointed nurture, as he can renew an adult through any other appointed means of grace. The effectiveness of the means always depends on the attendant blessing of God. What right have we, in our views, to exclude transforming grace from the nurture which God has instituted for moulding the spiritual life of the infant members of his church? He has placed them right in the midst of this influence into which he has thrown the power of a quickening grace, as, *potentially*, Christians. Is it for us to deny the competency of the ordained means?

The first class of proofs, on this head, may be drawn from the Scriptures. We mention only a few.

In Mal. 2: 15, we have the appointment of the family to this holy design. On this verse, Dr. Harris remarks:—"When vindicating the inviolable sanctity of the conjugal tie, the prophet asks, 'Did he not make one? though he had the residue of the Spirit? And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed.' The original formation of one man and one woman into 'one flesh,' or conjugal body, contemplated the rearing of a pious offspring. Other and inferior ends were to be secured by it, but this was its ultimate design."—*Patriarchy*, p. 449. Does not this divine appointment imply that the family constitution is adapted to fulfil the office assigned it? Has God thrown an impossible work on this agency?

The institution of a distinctively Christian household education, is apposite. "*Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*"—Eph. 6: 14. This form of expression indicates the existence of a peculiar and divine nurture, that is to encompass the child and mould him to God, and set him forth with Christian character. Men mistake the character of this training, and substitute a miserable burlesque of nurture for it. It does not consist only of a little instruction now and then, and some government, all contradicted by parental example. It is not fulfilled by any amount of formal teaching and admonitory advice. It is rather the

encompassing spirit of the family life and piety that wields the power of Christian nurture. The incipient feelings of infancy take hue from the mother's spirit while yet on the mother's knee; it breathes the breath of piety about the family altar, before it knows what piety is. It is formed to *doing* before it is formed to *thinking*. And the "nurture of the Lord," implies the filling of the house with this heavenly spirit, as well as heavenly teaching, in which the infant soul may open and take form, which may draw out its developing powers. This is the required nurture, and it is but honoring the divine arrangement, to regard it as competent, with the promised blessing of quickening grace, to cause the child to grow up a believer. It is to be expected that Christian culture will differ, both in itself and in its results, from that which is not Christian. Now, it is the distinctive mark of all unchristian training, that it unfolds from childhood an unchristian manhood. It has no higher aim than this; and if it ever dreams of something better, it trains only for subsequent conversion. Is Christian nurture nothing higher than this? Is it not appointed to a better result? Has it not a more sacred and sanctifying power? Surely God's plan of education is not intended to make sinners, or to produce first a crop of sin, and after that a crop of repentance. Is it not palpably absurd, to suppose that God would appoint a distinctive nurture for the infant members of his church, the object and result of which, though faithfully used by parents, would be, to leave the child just where other training does? When the family life and nurture are made what God meant them to be, the proper result will be attained, and the children will grow, not in stature and sin together, but "in stature and favor with God."

We are furnished, further, with an *example* of the operation of family piety in the formation of character. To Timothy, Paul says, "I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grandmother, Lois, and thy mother, Eunice; and I am persuaded in thee also." 2 Tim. 1: 5. Who can doubt that it was the sanctified household nurture that transmitted the heritage of faith to Timothy? This record is a fine illustration of the proper results of pious training.

In turning to the intrinsic nature of the family constitution, we are compelled to see ample confirmation of its competency to mould character.

The *oneness* of the family, invests it with a power seldom appreciated. Indeed, the disorganizing tendencies of our age refuse to let us think of organic constitutions in any other light, than as an assemblage of units, whose power is rather weakened by discord, than increased by combination. A bald individualism wants us to separate the members of the domestic group, and view them, like so many marbles thrown together, with no bond of union but nearness of place and a common name. The fact that it is a *divine constitution*, and has a specific power as such, is altogether overlooked. There is in it a common life, and an organized relationship of energy, competent to produce a common character. The parents' character is reproduced in their offspring. Their views, feelings and principles go into them, not only when they design to direct and form them, but even more when they do not. They must form their children's character, either by attention or neglect. A garden may be made clean by intentionally dressing it; it is made weedy when left alone. In either case, it becomes what the gardener makes it. Parental power is exerted by presence, and character passes over as by a law of contagion. The child cannot help opening to the influences that develop it; as the flower cannot help opening to the sunshine. The common atmosphere of the house enters into the tone of its common sentiment. The central life, if its power is unbroken by exterior forces, will mould the youthful character over a common model. This family influence doubtless leaves room for accountability in the young. But yet it imposes on parents a fearful responsibility, in the accumulation of power it compels them to wield. The family life will be a permanent part of the child's life. It will be recognized in him, wherever he goes. "The odor of the house will be in his garments." The germ of character planted in him at home, can never be wholly crushed out of his nature.

All associated relations modify and give a common tinge to character connected with them. Every community has its own peculiarities. Almost every member is affected by the prevalent sentiment. They are rubbed together and wear off each other's peculiarities. An isolated man, morally self-formed, and forming no one else, is a mere fiction; never realized, never can be. Every church has its own coloring of life, flowing from its own organization and prevalent style of doctrine and piety. You can tell a Quaker, for instance, as well by the peculiar tone that the church gives his character, as by the peculiar cut it gives his coat. The State, too,



shows the same thing. National character can be bounded by its peculiarities, as clearly as national territories. No one doubts that the Irish character differs from the Scotch. Who expects to find the mercurial character of the French in the honest and laborious German, or in the matter-of-fact Englishman? The Yankee is the natural product of his New England home. The Hottentot is the product of his Gentile or nomadic life. China makes a Chinaman of a nature that Arabia would form into an Arab. Turkey makes a Mohammedan of one whom Spain would constitute a Papist. Now if the looser and more remote connection that binds otherwise isolated individuals into communities, churches and states, superinduces distinctive character, are we not most unreasonable, to suppose that the closer and more living unity about the altar of home, where one blood pours through all veins, and one interest fills every mind, and one love throbs in every heart, and one parentage instructs and guides all, is not competent to develop a oneness of character, and form the moral life on a common model?

The unity of the family throws all the members under the formative influence of a common activity. The power of control resides in the united head, and parental direction decides the activity of the house. Infancy is necessarily passive and recipient. Prior to its own will, and afterwards in opposition to it, formative influences are giving direction to its unfolding powers. Far back, at the first dawns of mind, its attention is arrested, its thought is guided, its feelings are drawn forth. Everything it sees done, every sound it hears, every face that smiles on it, and every one that frowns, is entering its soul, is acting as a developing agency, and giving tinge and color to the childish character. The white sheet of its mind is being written over with images that come to it through all its senses. Mental Philosophy assures us that this is the way the activity of the mind is first drawn forth. Will not the activity be modified by the developing force? Is there no difference in the child's feeling awakened by a father's passion-clouded face and startling oath, and that awakened by the angel-like sweetness of a mother's prayer? The parental life reproduces itself in the impressible spirit of the child, daguerreotypes its image upon the character it is forming. It is not the office of childhood to choose, except to choose as it is taught. It learns the lesson before it, whether it be good or bad. Afterward, the parents choose the child's

school, select his books, determine his church, and place him under its teaching. God has made their word his law. What they command, he must do. Yet what he does, makes him what he becomes. The household must all move in the appointed circle; and, "like stones rolled in a brook, they wear each other into common shapes." Who ever looks for amiable, kind and gentle children, in a home in which parental effort is expended in bitter complaints and angry denunciations? If a father is profane, who thinks that his little ones will not learn to swear? If a mother is light and gay, will her example make her daughters sober and spiritual? Whatever activity parental authority sets in motion, must be shared in by all the house, and this harmonious working grinds out its common character. The children choose not the process that forms them. The mountain top chooses not whether it will be chilled by the winds, or whitened by the snows. The clay on the potter's whirling wheel chooses not whether it will go round; nor do the children, on the wheel of activity on which parental power is moulding their moral life. And to expect that their character will be formed after an opposite model from that which forms it, is not only as unreasonable as to look for an effect without a cause, but as absurd as to expect it contrary to its cause. Now, if the family unity be also a unity in Christ, if home be the hallowed abode of heartfelt piety, if it be filled with a heavenly atmosphere, and its activity be all instinct with "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," a law that "sets free from sin and death," who can deny the greatness of the power it may wield, to bless and train for God, the infant membership of his church?

Considerations might be drawn from the *depth* and *permanence* of early impression, to set the competency of Christian nurture in still clearer light. It works down among the very elements of human nature, and leaves its results at the foundation of character. It directs the current close by the fountain. The same effort could not turn the accumulated stream. It directs just when natural forces are taking direction. The freshness of children's feelings makes every impression strong. The newness of every emotion agitates the whole microcosm of the child's being. The apparently light and dancing thoughtlessness of early age, is apt to cause us to think that all its impressions are superficial and fleeting; that, like tiny waves upon a lake, they obliterate each other and disappear forever. Rather do they move on eternally, breaking with high crests on the shores of eternity. An observer of children,

is often astonished to see how the merest trifle will fix their attention, and set their minds on a train of curious thought. The adult, through whose mind old and new thoughts have long been passing with familiar tread, will learn of mighty events, and listen to the intelligence of commotions in which nations are dashed to pieces, with less stir of feeling than swells in the breast of childhood at the simple "story" of entertainment heard at the mother's knee. "Thought-tracks" on the tender heart of youth, are made deep; often stamped in unhappy marks to be seen in after days. All experience proves that they are permanent. Philosophy says, they are never lost, and may reappear in the registry of a dread "book of remembrance," whose leaves are the infolded experiences of the soul. They often recur, and childhood is lived over again, hundreds of times, during the pilgrimage of life.— Their influence, as a silent but mighty power, permeates the character; sometimes lifting it, with an angel-like glory, to the fellowship of the skies; sometimes dragging it down, defiled and blackened, to the pit of despair. Geology shows us the marks of ripples and rain drops in the rocks which were once the beach of an ancient sea, and which bears these enduring memorials of the play of summer waves, or the dropping of summer showers in a far distant, incalculable past, that have left these ineffaceable traces of their action to a remote future. So the influences of family nurture about the young soul, may be as light as the gentle breeze that sends its little wave upon the rocky strand, or as transient as the evening shower, whose drops are dotted on its sand; yet after unmeasured ages shall have gone by, the ripple marks and rain drops of that nurture, shall be found graven into the permanent character, as with the point of a diamond forever.

These facts show us the power of the family constitution over the character that is formed in it. In point of natural forces, it is the most potent agency among men. And when God sanctifies this agency, and throws into its nurture his own transforming grace, and pledges the needed blessing, who will dare assert that he claims too much, when he places the infant members of his church in its care, and looks to it to train them for him? Can anything but a criminal wish to avoid the duty, prompt parents to plead that the task is impracticable?

3. The practical bearings of this subject are far-reaching and important. They are "fast bound up" with the prosperity of the church and the salvation of souls.

The first duty is to bring forward the children of the covenant for the baptismal seal. This is sadly neglected. Has not God "a controversy with his people," on this subject? His plan sees in his own ordained "nurture," a means graciously rendered competent to unfold Christian character in them, and therefore requires that they be baptized. Error looks not for them to grow up as Christians, and therefore lets them go unbaptized. Is it not a terrible guilt for parents thus to be false to the demands of the covenant—false to the birthright of their children—false to the religious power which heaven designed the family structure to wield?

Are not Christians solemnly bound, also, to keep the sanctifying power of home, unbroken by influences from the world without? Admit that its spirit and training are such as would sanctify the children. Admit that there every evil influence is checked, and every germ of grace is fostered. This hallowing power must be diligently guarded, that it be not neutralized and overcome. Hard is it, in this age, to keep out a vicious literature; a literature in which there are "seven devils," and prevent it from polluting the young hearts about the Christian hearthstone. But it must be done, if the moral interests of the family are to be kept secure. Hard too, is it to keep children from street nurture. Yet this also, must be done, else their souls will surely be blighted. What must be the result of letting them run at large, and learn all the wickedness of the little criminals that infest the streets of every town and village? Must not their hearts receive an injury which no subsequent care can repair, from the intensified sins they see and hear? Their nature takes in the pollution like a sponge. A little angel would be stripped of his wings in such a process. And can parents then wonder why their home nurture is so inefficient? Are they not recreant to a most sacred trust? Has not God committed to them the care of these souls? What right have they to let them pass out, to be deformed by sin? The obligation is not more imperative, to have a sanctifying nurture at home, than it is to keep them under it.

The nurturing influences are to be employed in *faith*. To expect defeat will insure it. What is it but infidelity, to question the truth of the divine assurance, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old *he will not de-*

*part from it?"* We know of nothing more absurd, than that the poor child must be hardened in sin, before it can be started toward heaven; nothing more cruel, than that it must pass through the fires of Moloch to reach the altar of Christ. Where are we taught that it must be rolled round and round in the mud and filth of apostacy, before it can undergo a gracious change? Sad indeed would it be, if Christ had made no provision to minister saving grace to the perilous age of childhood. Has it to travel, exposed to death at every turn, up to manhood, before a renewing power can gift it with Christian character? Yet this seems to be the practical belief of thousands of professing parents. Under its influence, all nerve is taken out of the fostering hand, and the lambs of Christ's flock are left to be scattered and torn by the world. To neglect these little ones, is to yield them up to the mastery of Satan, and he will blight and destroy what Christians fail to keep for God. Their duty is plain. It is, to use the means with an unfaltering faith, and to expect their children all to stand with them, as believers, around the altar of Christ.

They are always to *treat them as members of the church, and under Christian obligations.* They are never, for a moment, either by word or act, to let them under the impression that they are not bound to live as believers. Here is one of the most disastrous errors of Christian parents. Their conversation and conduct create, in their offspring, the idea that they are independent of religious restraint until they publicly assume the Christian profession, and may act as they would have no right to act afterward. But where, in the Bible, can authority be found for this? Are not parents bound by the covenant and by their own vows, for the Christian conduct of their children? Questions of duty and propriety, in this connection, meet them at every turn. There are customs of society, forms of amusement, and many things of kindred character, which they, as members of the church, deem unsuitable for themselves, but which they yet allow, and even encourage their children to adopt. But what right have they to permit in their children, what would be felt to be wrong for themselves? How dare pious parents, whose consciences would reproach them for joining in the senseless and sinful dance, send them to the dancing school, and allow them to indulge in amusements that are essentially and distinctively worldly? Not a syllable of revelation warrants this sliding scale of duty. And the results of its practice are most mel-

anchoy. The church membership of the young is made to appear as having no significance, and involving no obligation. It imposes no restraint, and is shorn of its guardian and sanctifying power. The church itself is cursed with the loss of those on whom its seal and its hope were both placed. How different would it be, if they were always made to feel the reality of their true position. Were they treated uniformly as Christians from their very childhood, would it not exert a mighty power to cause them to be what their relation requires? The way to make a man your friend, is to treat him as such. A different process would hardly win him. And if the young are to be engaged in close and loving union with the church, they must be made to feel the reality of their connection with it, and the force of the confidence with which it looks for the pious performance of their duties. This feeling can be awakened by the family training; a feeling that the whole household is bound by the laws of Christian life and consistency.

Is it not apparent, from all these things, that the family structure holds a most important relation to the prosperity of Zion? Shall the church never be able to keep its own offspring from guilty unfaithfulness to domestic training? How long shall it have to expend its main efforts to win back what is lost by parental neglect? to reconquer its own conquests? Were its acquisition of Christian families permanent, "in their generations," with what accumulated numbers and strength it could move forward to subdue the world! How would opposition break before its progress! The watchmen on every tower of Zion would herald the dawning of the millennial morning. Victory would quickly succeed victory, until the "house of the Lord should be established on the top of the mountains."

## ARTICLE VI.

## BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS.

## No. VII.

Annual Commencement, September, 1841. Class: Messrs. Albaugh, Baker, McClellan, Cornell, Donmeyer, Gerhart, E. Miller, Scherer, Weaver, Witmer and Ziegler.

YOUNG GENTLEMEN:—In compliance with a custom which exists in our College, it devolves upon me, before we separate finally, to express the best wishes of your instructors for your future usefulness and happiness, and to bid you depart with our warmest desires that your future career may be honorable. Before you pass away, and whilst you yet linger in these sacred enclosures, let me once more impart a word of well intended counsel, and endeavor to animate you in the pursuit of the noble and the good. The advantages of education are confessedly great. On this subject there is not much diversity of opinion, among those qualified to judge. In civilized nations, the training of the human mind has always been regarded as an object of paramount importance. It is nevertheless true, that there are some, perhaps we may say many, who have enjoyed the privileges of a liberal education, who do not greatly recommend it by the fruits which they exhibit. It is reasonable to expect of those who have come under influences which are highly appreciated, and who claim for themselves a prominence among men by their intellectual endowments, evidences of superiority of a decisive character. If these are not exhibited, either the cause of education itself must suffer, or opposition be raised against the particular processes adopted in the prosecution of it. Has not the opinion not only been started, but extensively entertained, that the course of instruction so generally pursued in all Christian countries, and which has so long sustained itself by the most splendid evidences, as best suited for the development of the human mind, is greatly overrated, that it accomplishes far less than it proposes, and that it would be easy to substitute others still more effective? This has unquestionably been the case. The solution of the phenomenon is to be found in the fact that educated men very often fall below the reasonable expectations that are formed concerning



them. Can this be accounted for without a resort to the theory specified? Can it be explained so as to leave the fame of our schools untarnished? I suppose it can, and I will, in the brief space allowed me, attempt to solve the mystery; and in doing so, I will spread before you the course which you must pursue, if you desire to avoid the reproach of much promise and little performance—a loud profession, and no practical results. It is the proper time for you now to understand this subject, and the great crisis in your life in which you may start in a path which will conduct you to a different goal.

We leave out of view the case of those who have been denied by the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, the requisite capacity for literary and scientific attainments.

Though the capacities of men may fit them for the greater and the less, most men may achieve much by the proper appliances. But we fail very frequently: first, because we think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think. The counsel of that eminent teacher of the Christian religion, Saul of Tarsus, though in its primary application intended to bear on our spiritual, is no less important in regard to our intellectual interests. "Let no man think of himself more highly than he ought to think; let him think soberly." To know our true position is all important to future success. We should neither estimate too highly, nor undervalue it. Although the propensities of human nature may be strongly to pride, and little apprehension be entertained that we may depreciate our standing, it is nevertheless true that this does occur, and is an error of serious magnitude and baneful effects. If, after having passed through the preliminary stages of education, and, in some measure, learned "the extent of art," we look at the slowness with which the human mind progresses in the acquisition of truth, and the tendency of our ideas to pass into oblivion, and then view the work to be accomplished, before we can claim to have come up to our birthright, we sit down in despair, and utter words disheartening to effort in so hopeless a cause, we do injustice to ourselves, to our advantages, and make not the becoming response to the calls of providence. From this position, we pass without effort into the ranks of those who do discredit to education by falling below its promise, and we strengthen the scepticism of those who are opposed to it. There is a confidence in ourselves, that is necessary to success, in whatever direction we may prefer to labor; and it is most true that it is a

very great impediment to literary respectability or eminence, to be intimidated by the difficulties of the undertaking.

If, on the other hand, as is more frequently the case, we suppose that the meaning of our transition from the hands of our teachers to self-control and study, is that we have executed the work given us to do, and have nothing more to accomplish; that we are scholars overflowing with the spoils of learned research, and not, as it has been expressed, "have finished our education and commenced our studies;" the consequence will be the same as in the other case; we will sit down in supineness; we will make no suitable efforts, and will present, at no very distant period, a spectacle most humiliating and unbecoming; the spectacle of human beings with literary endorsements, and no literature; with College honors, and no learning; and education tried under our auspices, will suffer gross injustice, and our teachers and *Alma Mater* will participate in the reproach. Men of this stamp had long since extinguished the light of science, if there had not been others more faithful, who saved it from extinction.

This, then, is our first reason; from overrating our attainments, we paralyze future efforts, and in this way accomplish less than is reasonably expected of us. What shall be the result of the expectations formed concerning us; are they too, destined to be frustrated? It is for you to determine. Capable of choice, of determination, it is for you to decide. May we not entertain the hope that you will regard yourselves as beginners in the walks of human learning, who have attained the requisite strength to move along therein, and that you will regard your life as properly consecrated to diligent progression in the way opened before you; fain would we entertain these expectations. May we not be disappointed! If we are not, well will it be for you and the cause that we advocate!

Another reason is, that we do not pursue our studies with sufficient ardor and method. It is not enough to study occasionally, by snatches, or loosely and without plan. It is not to be denied that success demands effort, much toilsome effort, effort properly directed, systematic effort. By sudden and short incursions into the domain of truth, we may gather some fruits; but it is by well planned and persevering movements that we load ourselves with the richest treasures. Learn of those whose success has been most eminent, and you will be convinced that it was due, not so much to superior abilities,

or pre-eminent facilities, as to persevering and indefatigable exertions. Let us not fail to meet the reasonable expectations formed concerning us, by withholding the skilful prosecution of the means of mental opulence. To you, I would say, as I have said to a class which preceded you, "It is industry, *improbis labor*, that overcomes difficulties." There is no royal road to science. No man can become distinguished without application, and much of it. It is idle to think of it. The indolent gentlemen, who have reputation for extensive and scientific attainments, are incorrectly reported; they may have a smattering, but they cannot be profound; they may make a display in a few things, but if rigidly tested, submitted to a crucial experiment, they would be found wanting. As much application as is consistent with your duties to your Creator, to society and yourselves, as can be made without injury to the proper physiological condition of your bodies, may safely be recommended. More than this is objectionable, both in a moral and economical point of view. A bleeding conscience cannot be stanchd by literary attainments. The man who carries with him a consciousness that nothing, however high or holy, has been able to turn his attention from the prosecution of his studies, that the duties of religion, the claims of his fellow-men, founded on the strongest ties, have been neglected for the acquisition of knowledge, has created within his breast an enemy that will vitiate all his enjoyments. We can never think that the man who impairs his health, and prematurely closes his life by intemperate study, has duly measured the duties of his station. If then, the want of diligence is another cause, you will know how, by the application of it, to escape the danger.

The last reason that we will assign, is that educated men do not feel their responsibility, and therefore disappoint the expectations that are excited.

We have nothing to say upon the general subject of man's responsibility to a higher power. We must proceed upon that as admitted. If it be taken for granted that man is responsible for what he does, it is a very obvious deduction from the principle that his responsibility is commensurate with his advantages. If much be given us, much is reasonably required of us. Such is the dictate of reason, such the declaration of the statutes of heaven. If then, educated men are in advance of others, in regard to their capability of progressing in knowledge and exerting a beneficial influence upon others, it is expected, it is required by that Being to whom

we are all amenable, that they should undertake, and so far as success can be commanded by human effort, should accomplish more. If, however, we set out in life with no conviction of our dependence on God, with no sense of our responsibility, no persuasion that it is at our peril we fall below a high standard of excellence, we shall fail, inevitably fail, and though we may look around upon others, and feel complacency in the belief that we are at least equal to them, it is a deceitful gratification, based upon narrow conceptions of our obligations, and liable to the reproof that, in not doing more than others, we have been recreant to our duty, because we were under the highest and holiest obligations to do more.

Should we, then, regard ourselves as not our own, but as the servants of the Most High, placed and sustained in this world for vigorous and persevering action, then will we invest our efficiency with great power, and do credit, both to ourselves and the cause of education. Whilst an approving conscience and an approving Judge will sustain us in our toils, an approving world will hail us as an honor to our race, and highly will they prize the instruments by which, under God, we have been enabled so fully to meet the claims of our duty.

Go then, with our best wishes, to fulfil your destiny ! Be humble, be diligent, be conscientious !

Remember that life is short, that it is rapidly passing away. What your hand findeth to do, do it with your might. Make it your aim to act so that no cause, that you have conscientiously espoused, shall suffer through you ; that truth and righteousness may prevail more and more ; then, having been good men and true, your path will be as the shining light, shining more and more till the perfect day, and your end will be that of the upright—peace. May it be so !

## ARTICLE VII.

## REMINISCENCES OF LUTHERAN CLERGYMEN.

## XLII.

## WILLIAM SCHMIDT.

THE subject of our present memoir was born December 11, 1803, in Duensbach, near Kirchheim, in the kingdom of Wurtemberg. It was his privilege and happiness to be descended from a long chain of pious ancestors. His father, grandfather and great grandfather were all ministers of the Gospel. His father was Rev. George Frederick Schmidt,\* a man of sound and vigorous intellect, who was interested in the culture of his children, and spared no efforts to furnish them with the proper facilities for mental improvement. He, with the mother, also sowed the seeds of religion in their hearts, and lived to witness the happy fruits of the care and labor bestowed upon them, furnishing another illustration of the importance and value of early parental instruction.

William pursued his preparatory studies, under the direction of his father, and early manifested quickness of perception and success in the acquisition of knowledge. He then entered the Saxon Gymnasia of Schleusingen and Meining-

\* George Frederick Schmidt was the son of Rev. Francis Christian Lewis Schmidt and Maria Regina Seis, and was baptized when he was three days old. He commenced the study of the Latin when he was in his sixth year, and having read *Cornelius Nepos* and *Curtius*, when he was ten years old his father required him to converse with him altogether in the Latin. He continued to be the pupil of his father until he was fifteen years old, when he was placed at the Gymnasium, and thence removed to the University of Erlangen. He was subsequently a tutor in a noble family. In 1790 he was ordained, and the following year became, in consequence of the failure of his father's health, assistant minister, and afterwards his successor at Duensbach. In 1793 he was married to Catherine Margaret Kochendorf, having been engaged to her fourteen days. He speaks of her, in his Autobiography, as his faithful, industrious, prudent companion, and exemplary in every respect, and further adds: "The happiness of my married and domestic life was founded, not on her birth or wealth, but on her good sense and purity of heart, and if there ever was a marriage in the world which was happy and blessed of God, it was my own!" Such a woman was worthy to be the mother of the subject of our sketch. She died in 1834, greatly lamented, and making a "solitary home." Her husband lived till the winter of 1850, just eleven years after the death of his son William.

en, where he soon became distinguished for his classical attainments.

So enthusiastic was he in the work to which he had devoted himself, that he studied with an intensity that left no time unemployed. For a long period, he took only four hours' sleep, during the twenty-four, often studying with his feet in water, to keep him awake. His nervous system, naturally so weak, that when a child the shrill sound of a steel Harmonican would throw him into convulsions, was very much impaired by this severe application. In 1823 he was transferred to the University of Halle, where he pursued his theological studies with the same indefatigable industry and untiring zeal which characterized his former efforts. After the expiration of three years he left the University, a fine scholar, possessing an extensive acquaintance with the various departments of theological science, and in accordance with the practice of the country, was received as a candidate of theology in the kingdom of Wurtemberg.

Not long after this, having previously declined an invitation to give his services as tutor in the family of the British Consul at Teneriffe, he started for the United States, in company with a younger brother, with the view of rejoining two other brothers who had previously gone thither. He reached Philadelphia in the summer of 1826. Here he remained nearly a year, acting in the capacity of editor of a German periodical, called the *American Correspondent*. He then removed to Holmes County, Ohio, where purchasing land, he became one of the original proprietors of the present flourishing town of Weinsberg, principally settled and inhabited by European Germans. Having been examined and received as a candidate of theology before he left the fatherland, he here at once organized several small congregations, influenced, not by pecuniary considerations, but by a desire to do good and a deep interest in the welfare of the people, who were destitute of the regular ministrations of the word and the sacraments. His efforts were not in vain. It is said "that the inhabitants of that region have reason always to remember with gratitude, the blessing that attended his labors for their spiritual good." The following year he was admitted as a member of the Synod of Ohio, and subsequently entered upon a wider field of usefulness, as pastor of the Lutheran church at Canton, Ohio.

It was at this period, that vigorous efforts were made to establish a Theological Seminary at Columbus, under the aus-

pices of the Ohio Synod, and attention was immediately directed to Mr. Schmidt, as a man possessing the qualifications necessary for the Professorial chair. His talents, varied attainments, and exemplary deportment, had won the confidence and secured the regard of his brethren in the ministry, with whom he was associated. He was accordingly, at the meeting of Synod held in Zanesville, 1830, unanimously elected to the office, and as soon as he could make his arrangements, entered upon the discharge of its duties. He was, at the same time, also chosen pastor of the German Lutheran congregation in Columbus. In this important field of usefulness he continued successfully to labor, with a brief interruption, until he was called to his rest. His health, however, became seriously impaired under the pressure of his manifold engagements, and in 1837 he, for a season, relinquished his duties. Having obtained leave of absence for eight months, he visited his native country, for the purpose of once more seeing his aged father and friends, and in the hope that the voyage would resuscitate his shattered constitution. The father thus speaks of the occasion: "In November, 1837, my son William came back from America to pay me a visit, and to comfort me; also to offer me a peaceful home in America. It gave me indescribable pleasure to embrace this exemplary and dutiful son, after a separation of twelve years, and to press him to my paternal heart. I would have accepted his oft-repeated invitations, if the tears of my daughter, who remained in Germany, had not withheld me." The son returned to the United States the following year, apparently very much improved in health, and the hearts of many were gladdened at the prospect, that was presented, of increased usefulness. He resumed his duties with great zest and renewed energy, but he was soon again prostrated, in consequence of his multiplied and severe labors. His death, it was supposed, was hastened by intense application and excessive exertion. On the day preceding his last illness, he had preached a sacramental sermon, and administered the Lord's Supper to upwards of two hundred communicants; although he was, at the time, in feeble health, and his system very much fatigued by the effort, yet there was a sick child to be baptized, some distance from the church, and nothing could induce him to neglect what he conceived to be a positive obligation. His friends, observing his faint and exhausted condition, expostulated with him in reference to going, but without effect. He did not consult his own convenience, he even disregarded the



state of his health. He felt that it was his duty to attend the call. This was his last official act. From the administration of this baptismal ordinance he went to his bed, whence he never rose. He was immediately attacked with nervous fever. After an illness of fourteen days he died, on the 3d of November, 1839, in the thirty-sixth year of his age. Death "found him with his loins girded and watching," and he was translated from the scene of his toils and conflicts, to that of his rest and victory. His life had been consecrated to the Redeemer, his end was peaceful and triumphant.

Deep feelings of sorrow pervaded the institution yet struggling in its infancy, on the occasion of Professor Schmidt's death, whilst a large circle of devoted friends mourned with unaffected grief the loss which had been sustained. His many virtues, and the important services which he had rendered, awakened the warm and grateful remembrance of all. At his funeral Rev. J. Wagenhals delivered an address in German, full of pathos and Christian feeling, and Rev. Dr. Hoge, of the Presbyterian church, pronounced an appropriate discourse in the English language. His father, on receiving the distressing news of his son's death, remarks: "This mournful intelligence overwhelmed me and mine in Europe, and mine in America. For with the departure of our William, the most beautiful star of our prosperity and hopes, in this fleeting, terrestrial life, faded away for them and for me!"

"Gone to the grave in all thy glorious prime,  
Thy full activity of zeal and power,  
A Christian cannot die before his time,  
The Lord's appointed is the servant's hour!"

The remains of Professor Schmidt are interred in "*Green Lawn Cemetery*," near Columbus, where his pupils and children have unitedly erected to his memory, a neat marble monument, with the simple inscription, "Wilhelm Schmidt—1803—1839. *Unser Lehrer, unser Vater—Our Teacher, our Father.*" The monument is emblematically surmounted by a wreath of oak leaves and poppy. It bears the beautiful design of a minister of the church, clad in his clerical robes, with a cross leaning against his left arm—the right arm being elevated and pointing upwards. There is also on his left, a youth representing a pupil, and an altar with an open Bible lying upon it, at his right, upon which are engraven the words, from 1 Tim. 4: 11, "*Solches gebiete und lehre.*"

Professor Schmidt, in the autumn of 1831, entered into the married relation with Rebecca, daughter of the late John Buckius, of Canton, Ohio. He was the father of four children, a son, who died in infancy, and three daughters, all of whom are married to Lutheran ministers; the eldest to Prof. D. Worley, of Capital University, the second to Rev. P. J. Stirewalt, of New Market, Va., and the third to Professor E. Schmid, of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

From all that we have been able to gather, relative to the character of Prof. Schmidt, we infer that he was a man of an active, discriminating, and thoroughly disciplined mind, of thoughtful, studious habits, and of profound and extensive attainments. He was learned, not only as a Theologian and a Philologist, being master of not less than seven different languages, but he was intimately acquainted with other branches of science. He was regarded as a fine mathematician, and showed himself at home on almost every subject introduced in conversation. The testimony of those who knew him well, is, that he "never ceased to be a *hard student*, and was continually making additions to his stores of knowledge." It is also said, that "he possessed peculiar qualifications for the office of an instructor, combining with unwearied activity all the requisite talents and acquirements." He had the power of communicating knowledge in an interesting and satisfactory manner, and of clothing his thoughts in language clear and intelligible to all. His lectures and public addresses were of a popular character, and were generally received with favor. Many of the pupils, whose studies he directed, are now in active life, occupying positions of honor and usefulness; among the number are Professor Spielman, late President of Capital University, Professor Lehman, of the Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, Pastors Gast, Pope and Spangler, Professor Heyl, Principal of Esther Institute, Judge Matthews, George Parson, Esq., and others, in whose hearts his memory is still embalmed and cherished with affectionate interest.

In the earlier part of his ministry, Professor Schmidt inclined to very liberal views in regard to the doctrines of the church, but for several years before his death, he became a very decided orthodox Lutheran, and firmly adhered to the system of doctrines taught in the Symbolical Books. He was a most enthusiastic admirer of the German language, and had strong predilections for the German character. He often became very indignant when expressions of disparagement

were employed by those who showed that they were entirely ignorant of the subject on which they professed to speak in so profound and oracular a manner. At the same time, he was unsparing in his denunciation of conduct often witnessed in his countrymen, which was calculated to tarnish the German name, and bring dishonor upon the cause of religion.

As a preacher, Professor Schmidt was very acceptable. His preparation for the pulpit was careful. His style was, however, plain and simple, addressed more to the understanding than to the imagination or the passions. His discourses were generally interwoven with a considerable amount of Scriptural truth. He is also remembered as a successful pastor. He was faithful and laborious in his ministrations. His visits to the chamber of sickness were most useful and highly prized. He fulfilled to the letter the apostolic injunction, "Rejoice with them that rejoice, and weep with them that weep." He diligently labored with a willing and self-sacrificing spirit, was conscientious in the discharge of every duty, and in every position in which he was placed, exhibited the strictest integrity and an unsullied purity of life. Many excellent traits adorned his character. He was a man of great industry. He was always employed. Even during hours of recreation, strangers calling to see him, would find him, not unfrequently, busily engaged in his garden. His disposition was social, his conversational powers good, and his manners affable and agreeable. He was a most devoted friend, and possessed the faculty of securing, in a high degree, the attachment of all who were brought into intimate relations with him. Brief was the period allotted to him in this life, but that brief period was important in its results. He was devoted to the interests of the church in which he labored, and gave himself to the work assigned him with great industry and zeal. *Non annis, sed factis, vivunt mortales.*

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;  
In feelings, not in figures on a dial;  
We should count time by heart-throbs. He most lives  
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best."

We have been very much interested in the character of Professor Schmidt, as we have examined the material presented to our notice in the preparation of this sketch. He would, perhaps, have been more highly appreciated by the

Church, if he had been better understood, and his excellencies more fully known. Being a foreigner, and identified exclusively with our German interests, his intercourse and relations were confined to a small portion of the church. As we have, from time to time, been removing the moss from the tombstones of our departed worthies, and looking into their character, we have often thought, how misapprehensions might be corrected, asperities softened, and kind feelings promoted, if we understood one another better, if the Church were brought into more frequent contact, and views compared. After all, there is not so wide a difference as appears on the surface. If there is diversity on minor points, there is unity in essentials. We are one, belonging to the same family, laboring for the accomplishment of the same object, and hoping at last, through the merits of the Redeemer, to reach the same blessed end !

## XLIII.

## CHARLES HENKEL.

Rev. Charles Henkel was also descended from a long line of ministerial ancestors in the Lutheran church. The first of the name, who immigrated to this country, was Rev. Gerhard Henkel, who had served for a time, in his native land, as Chaplain in the University of Frankfort on the Rhine. He reached the United States in 1740, and settled in Germantown, Pa., where he assisted in the erection of a Lutheran church, which, however, he did not live to see completed, as he died soon after his arrival in this country. Every succeeding generation furnished its representative for the ranks of the ministry, whilst the father of the subject of the present sketch, and four of his brothers, were invested with the sacred office.

Charles Henkel was born on the 18th of May, 1798, in New Market, Shenandoah County, Va. His parents, Rev. Paul and Elizabeth Nagely Henkel, early dedicated him to God in baptism, and endeavored to train him under Christian influences. When he was yet a child, he was regarded by his companions as the miniature preacher, and often, when engaged in their youthful plays, they would have him officiate as the parson. Boy as he was, he even then seemed to have correct views in reference to the support of the ministry, for

we are told that, on a certain occasion, a crowd of boys having gathered around him, whilst he was holding forth from a stump for his pulpit, after he had finished his sermon, he said, "Are you going to let your preacher starve? Why don't you take up a collection?" He was received into the church, under the pastoral care of his father, by the rite of confirmation, April 8th, 1814, when he was about sixteen years old, and there is reason to believe that he devoted himself to the work of the ministry immediately after he gave his heart to God. He pursued his preparatory education at New Market, Va., and subsequently spent some time in Baltimore, more particularly in acquiring a more thorough knowledge of German and of Music. He studied Theology under the direction of his father, for at that time there was no Theological Seminary in connexion with our church. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Ohio, at its convention held in Somerset, in the year 1818, and immediately commenced his ministerial labors in Mason County, Va. But his first pastoral relation terminated at the end of two years. Having received and accepted a call to Columbus, Ohio, and associated churches, he removed thither in 1820. This was, at that time, a very difficult field of labor. It was a large district, composed of several congregations, and one of them distant twenty-five miles from his residence. Columbus, now a large and beautiful city, was then a small town, in the midst of woods and swamps, and surrounded by a country new and little improved, the roads indifferent, and very few, if any, bridges, so that he and his horse were often compelled to swim across the overflowing streams which lay between him and the place of his appointments. Log cabins, log churches, and log school houses have since been supplanted by elegant edifices, which, with other improvements, give a very different aspect to the country, which forty years ago was the scene of Mr. Henkel's labors. In this field he continued, amid many deprivations and toils, and often the victim of the diseases incident to a new country, until 1827, when he accepted a unanimous invitation to take charge of the Somerset pastorate, Perry Co., Ohio. Here his health seemed to improve, and he was much encouraged in the discharge of his duties. He had reason to believe that his labors were not in vain. "He exhibited," says a cotemporary, "all that energy of character and strength of intellect which, combined with a most amiable disposition, commanded the respect and secured the affections of the whole community in

which he lived. An ardent devotion to the cause of religion, an uncompromising opposition to error in every form, and a most tender solicitude for the spiritual welfare of the flock, were the prominent features of his life." His health, however, gradually failed him, and a pulmonary affection, which had been slowly developing in his system, prevented him, for a year before his death, from attending to his regular ministerial duties. But so strong was the attachment of his people to him, that they refused to call another pastor so long as he lived, and were unwilling to withdraw the regular funds for his support. During the latter part of his illness, his sufferings were most excruciating, but no murmur escaped his lips. He expressed an entire submission to the Divine will. To his friend, Rev. J. Manning, just before his death he said, "I have often endeavored to impart consolation at the bedside of the sick and the dying, and these same truths I now find so comforting to myself. The doctrines which I have believed and preached during my life, I shall now seal with my death." The only thing which he appeared to dread, was the pain connected with the separation of the soul from the body, but even this he was spared, for he fell asleep in death without a struggle or a groan. He had no fear of his last enemy. He had been long expecting him. But there was a firm and sustaining hope of heaven, founded solely on the merits of Christ. "When the Savior called for him, the servant was ready to meet his Lord." There was no ecstasy, no rapture, but being fortified by faith, "he had peace with God." He died on the 2d of February, 1841.

"His soul to Him who gave it rose;  
God led it to its long repose,  
Its glorious rest!"

The services of the funeral, which had brought together a large concourse of sorrowing friends, were conducted by Rev. J. Wagenhals and Rev. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, at the time Professor in the Theological Seminary at Columbus, Ohio, the former delivering a discourse in the German, and the latter in the English language. A large and beautiful monument has since been erected over his remains, by the congregations embraced in his charge, as an evidence of their tender regard and warm affection for his memory.

Mr. Henkel was twice united in marriage. His first wife was Mary C. Siegrist, of Mason County, Va. From this union there were two children, a son and daughter. The son

is Rev. D. M. Henkel, pastor of the Lutheran church in Stewartsville, N. J. His second wife was Mary Warner, of Columbus, Ohio, with whom he had one child, a son, who died in infancy.

Mr. Henkel possessed a clear and vigorous mind. He was a close student, and by diligence and application had become a respectable scholar. He seldom, if ever, entered the pulpit without the most careful and diligent preparation. His discourses were frequently written, but more generally a full sketch was used. He never failed to interest an audience, and his own people regarded him as quite an orator in the English as well as the German language. His sermons were able and instructive; they were delivered with a deliberate and distinct enunciation, and his manner in the pulpit was characterized by great calmness and solemnity. He possessed extraordinary influence in the Synod of which he was a member. He was often elected as presiding officer; when not its President, he was invariably appointed on the most important committees. He was regarded by all with feelings of deep affection and cordial confidence. When he presented his views on a subject, he was listened to with marked attention, and his opinions carried with them great weight in determining the measure adopted. He assisted in forming the English Synod of Ohio, organized in 1836.

He was a man of remarkable precision of character. This was seen in everything that he did. In the preparation of his sermons, skeletons, and even in his personal dress, there was a neatness and propriety not always found in the clerical profession. He also possessed great firmness of purpose. When he thought he was in the path of duty, he cared not for opposition or ridicule. He was never deterred from his purpose by the fear of man. He was regardless of praise or of censure, when he was convinced of the rectitude of his intentions. He was fearless and uncompromising in defence of what he believed to be the truth, and after having come to a deliberate conviction on any point, he was always ready to maintain his position. His doctrinal platform was the unaltered Augsburg Confession. In all his theological views he adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of the church. He was very regular and faithful in his observance of catechetical instruction, although in the community in which he dwelt, the practice was spoken of by many in terms of disparagement, and often with animadversion.



Several of Mr. Henkel's sermons were published in pamphlet form. One on the "Training of Children," and another on the "Unity of the Faith;" a third on the "Reformation by Luther," was printed by a resolution of his Synod. This was the occasion of a controversy between him and a Roman Catholic priest. He found no favor with Roman Catholics, in consequence of his unscrupulous hostility to their system of religion, and his exposure of many of its absurdities. When he died, some of them did not hesitate to assert that it was in answer to their prayers that he was removed from the world. In his discourse on the Reformation, are found his views in reference to the Papal church, and his love for that precious doctrine, which our own Luther pronounced "the article of a standing or falling church:" "It is most obvious Christ and him crucified were not the object of this system, and the people, destitute of him, were left to grope in darkness, and to feed upon the chaff and garbage of priestly follies and childish inventions. And so led from Christ, what were the consequences? And what are the consequences still, where these abuses are observed and enforced? Spiritual bondage unquestionably! For where there is a want of the knowledge of Christ, or a true understanding of the manner of becoming acceptable before God, men will necessarily submit to such precepts and injunctions as appear to them most likely to secure their eternal happiness, whether, indeed, such precepts and injunctions be found in the word of God, or whether they be invented by men; or whether they be rational, or absurd and ridiculous, or whether they be pleasant or painful; consequently the calm submission to every burden the papal system has been pleased to lay upon the necks of its subjects, from time to time, notwithstanding their intolerable weight and galling pressure. But, however deeply rooted these abuses had become, and while their advocates and supporters would have laughed at him who would have raised his hand against them, and attempted to emancipate those who had long groaned under their bondage, the Lord, whose counsels are counsels of wisdom, and whose ways are past finding out, in his own time fulfilled the desires of his people, and broke their bonds and fetters asunder. From this state, we are authorized to say, Christ has made us free. He accomplished the work in his own way, and by means which he selected in his own wisdom. Not the things that are great and mighty in the eyes of the world, but those which appear foolish to them, he chose for

this end. And it may well be said, he chose 'earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of him and not of man.' Hence, in the midst of darkness, whilst men were sitting a second time 'in the region and shadow of death, the day-spring from on high visited them.' When the papal hierarchy least expected to be humbled in its pride, and to have its power diminished, the hand of him appointed for the work was taking hold of its pillars, and he whom they thought to crush like a worm, became a mighty giant, and proved unconquerable. \* \* \* Luther was an instrument in the hands of Christ to make us free. But he accomplished the work in no other way than by bringing us back to Christ. He, and all who aided him, bore in mind that 'where the spirit of Christ is, there is liberty.' To bring us back to this source, he knew no other doctrine could be effectual but the *doctrine of justification by faith*. This he knew would at once strike at the root of the whole papal scheme, and set the troubled conscience at rest. 'This,' said he, 'is the only rock.' 'This rock,' continued he, 'did Satan shake in Paradise, where he persuaded our first parents that by their own wisdom and power they might become like unto God, who had given them life and a promise of its continuance.' 'The kingdom of Satan,' he added, 'is to be resisted by this heavenly and all powerful doctrine. Whether we be rude or eloquent, or whether we be learned or unlearned, this rock must be defended; this doctrine must be published abroad in animated strains.' \* \* \* "By maintaining this doctrine as the only basis upon which our spiritual liberty can rest, and bringing again to light the Holy Scriptures, the only source from which this doctrine can be derived, he shook the very foundation of papal superstition and error, diminished the power of Antichrist, and delivered thousands who had been groaning under its bondage."

Mr. Henkel was very much opposed to removing the "old landmarks" in religion. He resisted everything like a spirit of innovation in the doctrines and practices of the church. His views on this subject may be learned from the following passage, contained in one of his published discourses: "This spirit, though in no wise a part of genuine religion itself, has nevertheless, ever been cotemporary with religion. It has been found struggling for vent in nearly all religious denominations and classes of Christians, in almost every age. It has assumed various forms, and appeared under various modifications and aspects. To its influence man appears some-

what naturally inclined. He is a creature of passion, of a creative mind, fond of what is or appears marvellous, and ever disposed to be more influenced by what is sensual, than what is spiritual. Whatever, therefore, most effectually operates upon his animal passions, or produces the most lively imaginations, or appears most extraordinary, or corresponds most strikingly to his sensual views, he takes for realities in matters of religion. Hence his extreme liability to the influences of fanaticism. This spirit is generally known, from the direction it gives to the mind and the actions of those it influences. Where it prevails, wholesome instructions from the word of God are usually rejected. The word of God itself, indeed, is called a dead letter. The institutions of Christ, the Sacraments, are either altogether rejected, or are declared emblems without substance, and are so invalidated, that their power and efficiency cannot be felt. The influence of the Divine Spirit is sought, either without means, or such as are extraordinary. Animal feelings are relied upon as evidences of an acceptance with God, and as a testimony of vital religion. Those who differ from them in their views, are frequently regarded as deficient in piety, or wholly unconverted, and a malignant, intolerant and persecuting spirit is often manifested. Public worship, devotion, and all religious exercises, are usually forced to those extremities which a heated imagination and an excited state of feeling, free from due restraint, would naturally suggest. Feelings, imaginations and sensual views fluctuating from day to day, the individual who is under the influence of this spirit, is to-day full of all spiritual consolation, and to-morrow upon the very verge of despair. Frenzied and disturbed, he yields to convulsive throes, and sends forth shrieks of horror and anguish. And after all these commotions, the satisfactory evidence that was sought, is not found, and the troubling spirit remains in bondage and the fear of death."

He did not look with favor upon an external union of all religious denominations. He supposed that the present arrangement in the existing condition of the church, was the very best for true Christianity. He thought that if "all Christians were externally united, unanimous in the use of all the forms and ceremonies instituted of men, and known and distinguished by the same denomination, our spiritual liberty would be in greater danger than in the present divided state of Christianity. That kind of opposition which is usually found among denominations, by which one party stimu-

lates another to search after truth, and to guard against religious sloth and indifference, would cease. In the church, as well as the State, men are found, who seek their own interest more than that of the cause they are appointed to subserve. Such are never better furnished with an opportunity to carry their designs into effect, than when those whom they intend to deceive have fallen asleep around them. It is then that a corrupt and self-interested priesthood rivets if possible, both a civil and religious yoke upon an unwary and heedless world. When was it that the light of the Gospel was most eclipsed, and men most destitute of spiritual liberty? Was it not then, when the greatest boast was made of external union in the Christian church, when men, with almost one accord worshipped the beast, and submitted to have his name written on their foreheads, when the man of sin, arrogating to himself the vice regency of Christ, red with the fires of hell, premeditating with fire and sword, the destruction of all who dared to oppose him? The union of all true believers, like their king, is invisible. 'Their life being hid with Christ in God,' it does not matter whether their human ceremonies and modes of government harmonize or not. All their union which is discoverable, is their uniform obedience to the Lord's commands."

The subject of our sketch, in person, was well formed, tall, nearly six feet in height, rather slender, but erect, and of stately carriage, with black eyes and black hair. His fine appearance and expressive countenance would have attracted the attention of a stranger in a crowd, and led him to inquire who he was? He was a man of pleasant manners and affable address, rather sedate than communicative, yet cheerful and social in his disposition. He was always circumspect in his conduct, and dignified in his intercourse with others. He never appeared to forget his ministerial character. He was regarded, in the community in which he dwelt, as a man of worth and character. "The Church," says the *Western Post*, "lost one of its highest ornaments, when Mr. Henkel was called to his rest. Long will his memory be cherished in the bosoms of those to whom he was endeared; long will his congregations remember their faithful pastor, and the whole community regret the loss which they sustained, when one whose doctrines and whole life so highly recommended the cause of religion, was removed from their midst."

## ARTICLE VIII.

WHAT IS THE RESULT OF SCIENCE WITH REGARD TO THE  
PRIMITIVE WORLD?

Also a literary index of the most important works on this subject.

*Tota illa aetas periiit diluvio, sicut infantiam mergere solet oblivio.*—  
AUGUST.

*Translated from A. Tholuck's Miscellaneous Works.*

By Professor T. J. Lehmann, Pittsburg, Pa.

"EXPLAIN the traditions and narrations of the Bible, as you would any other old tradition and fiction, look only at their moral tendency, as you would in fables and tales of an Æsop, a Phædrus, a Lockman, a Lafontaine, a Lichtwehr, a Gellert, a Lessing, and consider not the garb in which it is clothed." "The history of the Creation, that of the Patriarchs, of the Deluge—is founded upon the traditions and myths of some ancient nation of the world, whose own ideas and understanding were yet feeble, and in whom reason had just commenced to free itself from the ignorance and wildness of barbarism. These *sayings* were farther arranged and formed, in accordance with the weak understanding of the Israelites, and so shaped and clothed, as to suit their condition. They were adapted to the condition of the Jewish nation of that period, within reach of their comprehension, sufficient and suitable for that people and its time, but, for our enlightened age, these tales and calculations are no longer sufficient."—Ballenstedt, Pastor at Brunswick, in his work entitled, *Die Urwelt*. "Natural Sciences," says another Theologian, (Bretschneider, in his "*Sendschreiben*") have caused more disturbance, and acted more destructively upon the doctrines of ancient Theology, than speculative Philosophy. Geology no longer agrees with Moses, as regards the Creation and the revolutions our globe has undergone. Unmindful of Theology, it teaches that the earth has gone through several great epochs of formation, of undefinable, but great length of time; and that the first formations upon it have again perished." "It was the sublime science of Astronomy. . . . that destroyed the ideas of antiquity with regard to heaven, to earth, to hell, to resurrection, to judgment, and to the end of the world, which to the time of the Reforma-

tion, had remained unchanged. Natural historians and travellers described the varieties of the human races, in form, color, and mental powers; the varieties produced by their intermixture, pointing out the remaining organic differences between them, and showing that they were not the result of climate or food, but that they were founded upon the *variety of origin*. Blumenbach collected human skulls from all parts of the world, and formed these views into a system. How embarrassing now the situation of the Theologian! If there is to be no longer *one* Adam for all mankind, but one Adam for the Caucasian, another for the Negro, a third for the American, a fourth for the Malay, and a fifth for the Mongolian, &c. Where is the dogma of the Bible, with its teachings of one Adam, of the fall, of sin transmitted by Adam upon mankind, and the whole doctrine of the inheritance of sin, as a consequence of the fall of Adam, and the inability of avoiding sin, descended to us through him. If all this is done away with, how is the necessity of Christ's substituting sacrifice, as the second Adam, to take away the sin of the first, to be proved? Where is the ground for condemnation of the heathen, who did not descend from Adam?"

This is the utterance of ministers of the Christian church in the nineteenth century. If we hear such words fall from the lips of the *guardians of the Christian sanctuary*, after the voice of a Julianus, a Porphyry, a Voltaire, had been silenced, who would not exclaim: "Oh Lord! deliver thy church of her friends; from her enemies, there is no danger." And the tendency, expressed in words, by two leaders of this movement, will continue to spread. Who can deny, although among a small number of our Theologians, science has been brought back into an intimate connection with the church, that with a large majority, a separation of Theology from the church, is irresistibly going on. Philosophy and natural sciences are taking the place of Divinity; Exegesis is replaced by Philology or Antiquarianism. The time is not far distant, nay, has in a measure arrived, when the young Theologian will look to a Professor of Mathematics, Anthropology or Natural Sciences, for explanations of Divinity and morality; and as Theology submits willingly to be taught and instructed by profane science, so will the church, as a national institution, subject herself to the service of State power. Deafened by the incessant cry of "*Great is our Diana of Ephesus!*" which the men of science (this title they have lately assumed) exclaim in praise of their Goddess, in all the journals, pam-

phlets and cyclopedias, scarcely a village schoolmaster or gymnasiant, let alone a candidate for Theology or a pastor, can be found, who quotes Jesus or Moses, without offering an apology. "As Jesus or Moses of old says," is the highest compliment thrown after these God-men, if they are allowed to occupy a place in the rear guard, behind the formidable front of the geniuses of the nineteenth century, for having, now and then, made some sensible remark.

The scientific sun of the nineteenth century has thrown his perpendicular rays *especially* upon the domain of the Antediluvian world and its history, causing all shadows to disappear, and those of the primitive world, that have thrown the influence of the Bible so extensively over mankind, to retire modestly into their proper sphere, the *world of fables*. And being confident of having perfected the work, the new discoveries could not soon enough be laid before the public. Ballenstedt's and Link's works on the primitive world, were avowedly written for the people;\* in fact, Ballenstedt deserves credit for having written so plainly, that even the uncultivated footman or cook, can gather from it the necessary illumination upon the productions of the primitive world.

Theology that would exclude from its dogma and creeds, the wide domain of human arts and sciences, with all its sound and unsound fruits, would certainly be wrong. No! a living interchange must be maintained; the Theologian must consult all that the wisdom of the times has brought to the surface, but as says the Apostle, "*be ye not the servants of men.*" Have not the theologians maintained a more or less lively intercourse with the various systems of Philosophy, of their time, and made use of the Apostolic words: "*All things are yours,*" in accordance with the greater or less degree of faith and understanding they possessed?

In our opinion, the word of God should neither build a wall between itself and the light of sciences, nor should it absorb its rays without refracting; but reproducing an image of more than seven fold beauty, it should indicate its own fulness by reflecting with greater brightness. We say then, at the outset, that we consider as normal, only those subjects

\* Cuvier's work is also written in a readable style for the greater number of the public; it instructs persons, not initiated in the science, in the hieroglyphics of the ancient world, created by God, as understandingly, as Champollion's précis in those of Egyptian invention; besides, French Professors generally—in contradistinction to the German—take pains to write their books for other persons, as well as for Professors.



of primitive Biblical history, as really pertain to religion, and that we willingly allow a ruling influence to physical and astronomical truths, upon those views and representations in the Scriptures, that belong to their province. How necessary it is, however, not to be too liberal in making this allowance, will be shown in the following essay. We also wish to communicate to our Theological reader, on matters concerning the primitive world, a little of "Papa Goethe's" caution, who expresses himself with regard to the then new Vulcanic theories, somewhat like the following:\*

Scarcely noble Werner is gather'd to his fathers,  
When Neptune's domain is destroyed;  
The world now worships at Vulcan's feet.  
I hesitate; for I can  
From its fruits only judge the tree,  
And oft have refused my Credo.  
No matter, new Gods or new Idols,  
I hate them all alike.

We undertake to review the most important questions with regard to the Antediluvian history; to present the results of the latest researches, and to examine whether, and how far, the main points found in history, as given by Moses, are overthrown by science. We have to preface this essay by two remarks: 1. That we obtain false views of the relation existing between Christian dogmas and science, if we adopt the dogmas as laid down in some books, protestant or catholic; and the same may be said of Natural sciences, if we take for truth, what we may find in many books, upon which we may, perchance, lay our hands. If we are satisfied with any work on dogma we find, we may be compelled, e. g., to enter upon a calculation, how much room will be needed on the day of judgment, for those to be judged; and rejoice with the Mathematician, in Ammon and Hänslein's Theological Journal, (Vol. III. p. 197) at the following successful refutation of the skeptics: "Allowing each century three thousand millions of people, and each person two feet to stand upon, we shall have for sixty centuries, the world being six thousand years old, one hundred and eighty thousand millions; consequently require three hundred and sixty thousand millions square feet. Since a single mile contains four hundred millions square feet, and the earth's surface about

\* Pocket edition, Vol. IV. p. 384.

nine millions square miles, one hundred and eighty thousand millions of people require only nine hundred square miles, or 1-10320th part of the area of the globe. The diameter of this area would be thirty-five, its radius seventeen and a half miles. Therefore, standing in the centre, on a mound of the height of Mont Blanc, one might overlook this vast assemblage." On the other hand, if we adopt the first chance book on Natural sciences for established truth, we will have to believe, e. g., with Buffon, the earth to be a piece of the sun, knocked off accidentally by a comet, requiring thirty-four thousand years to cool, before it could be touched, which would considerably puzzle the expounder of Genesis, who understands water to be the cause of the present form of our planet. Science stands not in as slight a connection with the man who discovers it, as with the tobacco smoke he may blow from his lips; it is his breath rather, and carries upon it the impress of the character of his liking and disliking. At a time like the present, when the mass of votaries of Natural sciences, as well as all other children of our age, and the latter perhaps more than the former, are so destitute of the pious hearts of the heavenward-turned minds of their forefathers, the result will show itself in their labors; it will be rather antipathetic to the interests of religion, than sympathetic. Consequently, many apparently great contradictions to truths in the Scriptures, adduced by individual philosophers, will, at the present time, appear in a less degree the contradiction of science itself. We should never forget, and especially not at the present hour, to draw a line of distinction between the contradiction of the scientific man, and that of the science. This introduces our second remark, viz:—Should a theologian, now and then, leave a question of the Naturalist unanswered, and remain silent, he will not feel disconcerted, for he will reflect that this or that philosopher not yet represents the science of Natural Philosophy, and he will further find consolation in the thought, that if a theologian were to catechize a Natural philosopher, the latter might, in his turn, on many points be reduced to silence.

The subjects we wish to contemplate, with regard to the primitive world, are the following:

1. The formation of the earth.
2. The extinct races of the primitive world.
3. The age of the world.
4. The first man, and in connection with it the place of his first appearance.
5. Primitive language.

# I. The Formation of the Earth.

If we pursue our researches of the origin of the world, we will finally arrive at a point involving the question, whence matter received its existence, and if philosophic reasoning crosses and blesses itself when arrived at this, the stopping place of all created reasoning, we expect to find the Naturalist much more willing to preserve silence. "Cosmogony," says A. v. Humboldt,\* "presupposes the existence of all matter now distributed over the Universe, and occupies itself only with the many changes through which this matter has passed, until it has arrived at its present form and combination. *All beyond this circle is a presumption of philosophizing reason.*" We place ourselves modestly one degree lower; we take matter as we find it, and ask, how has it become what it is? At that point then, Natural Philosophy has thought itself able to make a beginning. Pastor Ballenstedt, of Brunswick, (Urwelt, Vol. II. p. 2) is of the opinion that, "although we can never arrive at the whole truth, yet we have approached it (the manner how the world was created) considerably nearer than at the time of Zoroaster and Moses, since we possess a more accurate knowledge of nature, and of the internal formation of our earth; and herein we can see and judge with more certainty than men of the ancient world." Count Zinzendorf's opinion of all clever thoughts of children of man, that they will appear, some day, as so much scandal before the *Most High*, might be of some weight, at least in this instance of human smartness, since a Lichtenberg† reasons that nine-tenths of the fifty hypotheses he enumerates, belong rather to the history of the *human mind*, than to the *history of the earth*, and that the noble naturalist, animated by an impulse of imitative art, upon finding *sea animals* on dry land, *without a trace of an ocean*, gave us *conclusions without a trace of a premise*. Let us also listen to the opinion of another well known searcher in this branch of science:‡ "It has been remarked elsewhere, that the origin of the whole Universe, consequently also that portion of it which forms our earth, lies entirely beyond the reach of human knowledge.

\* Essay on the disengagement of Caloric, considered as a Geognostic phenomenon in v. Moll's *Jahrbüchern der Berg-und Hüttenkunde*, Vol. III. p. 6.

† Geologische Phantasieen, Göttingen Taschenbuch, für 1795, p. 79.

‡ Munke's revised Dictionary on Physics, by Gehler, 1828. IV. 2d division, p. 1278.

The means employed in our researches are nowise adequate to scan all parts of the Universe. Although the human eye, armed with gigantic telescopes, penetrates immeasurable distances, yet the space, imperfectly explored by this means, remains only an insignificant portion of the whole, and all that has been said about it, as the result of many carefully conducted observations, is, in by far the greater number of cases, mere supposition, and bold, although probable hypothesis. It would appear ridiculous, if we were to attempt an explanation of the origin of the almost unknown whole, from the knowledge we possess of the earth, and a few planets and fixed stars; *the modest Naturalist excludes it, therefore, from the sphere of Physics, and places it where it still properly belongs, into the province of religious belief.*" How is this? The theologians, Bretschneider and Ballenstedt, direct us to the schools of Natural Sciences, and these send us back to the school of faith? But so it is. And to prove that the modesty of the Naturalist, whose language we have just quoted, is not without good reason, we have only to bestow a passing glance upon a few of the most important hypotheses, of which Lichtenberg, in his time, already knew as many as fifty.

After the revival of sciences, Descartes was the first who attempted, by peculiar combinations, to explain natural phenomena, and their ultimate origin. In the beginning, there was a chaotic, hard, primitive mass, which by God's almighty power was broken, and set in motion by confraction of its parts. In consequence of this motion, the three elements sprang forth, from which the constituent parts of the Universe were formed, viz: a fine ethereal matter, small globules and particles of coarser nature and angular form. From the first arose the sun and the fixed stars; the second gave existence to ether, or to the matter in which worlds revolve; the third furnished material for the planets and comets. At first the earth was a star, having a revolving motion around its own axis only. There was, however, in its composition, an admixture of much coarse matter, which finally surrounded it with an opaque crust, through which, even now, the central fire penetrates in some places. In this condition, the earth was seized by the whirling motion of the sun, and carried along with it. The coarsest particles of the third element were precipitated first, and formed land and water. But since the finer particles of the third element, which were lodged upon the water, could not be entirely freed from the coarser,

a crust grew out of them, which finally broke down, and formed the dry surface of the earth.\* Halley, Herschel and Schubert discover a similar primitive matter in the nebulae of the heavens.

The geological hypotheses of two English Theologians, whose fate it seemed to be, to think in many respects differently from all other people, occupy the first rank after those of Cartesius. According to Thomas Burnet,† the earth was in the beginning a chaotic mass, from which the heavier particles were precipitated, and formed themselves into a nucleus, *around* which water, and *over* which air was collected. The latter discharged its oily and earthy particles, and reassumed its transparency. By this means a crust was formed around the earth, a fit habitation for mankind; only without mountains and valleys. This crust, dried by the heat of the sun, burst, after a lapse of sixteen hundred years; was thrown into the water, carrying along a quantity of air, by which the ocean was raised still higher, and destroyed all living beings during the deluge. The water retired gradually into subterranean caverns, left part of the ruins of the crust exposed, which now presented mountains and valleys, as the new abode of Noah, and those saved with him. Whiston says:‡ the earth was originally a comet, that developed itself gradually in the course of six years (the six days of the creation); the transformation of the crust of the earth, was caused by the approach of another comet, which, from its tail, partly discharged the waters of the deluge, and partly attracted the water from the cracked and partially elevated crust of the earth. According to Leibnitz,|| the earth takes its origin from fused matter, the cooling of which marks the separation of light from darkness, and the epoch of the beginning of creation. The deposits, by the heat vitrified formed a basis of the crust, and the lumps and bubbles in it, gave rise to mountains and caverns, as they now exist. The vapors contained in the atmosphere, condensed during

\* Principia philosophiae Amstel. lib. II. This hypothesis of Cartesius was also brought in harmony with the Bible, e. g. in Cartesius mosaizans, by Amerpoel.

† Telluris theoria sacra. Lond. 1681.

‡ A new theory of the earth, Cambr. 1708.

|| Protopgae sive de prima facie telluris et antiquissimae historiae vestigiis in ipsis naturae momentis. Acta erudd. Lips. 1693 separately edit. by Schneid, Göttingen, 1749.

the process of cooling, descended upon the earth, in form of water, dissolved the salts, and communicated its saltiness to the ocean. Cooling to a still lower degree, clefts were made in the earth, into which the water retired still farther; at a later period some of the highest portion caved in, and forced the water back over the whole surface. This the Deluge. Buffon says:\* A comet coming diagonally in contact with the sun, knocked off 1-650th part of its matter. From the fragments of this mass, all planets were formed, and received from the shock of the concussion their rotary motion around their own axes, and impelled by gravitation, commenced their revolutions around the central sun, and in consequence of their motion, became rounded and flattened at the poles. Since Buffon, as well as Newton, believed the sun to be red hot, this fragment must have been red hot also. It continued in this state during three thousand years, and required thirty-four thousand years to cool sufficiently to be touched. The cooling process gave rise to undulations and bubble-like elevations, the original valleys and mountains. What formed subsequently the ocean, was still suspended in the air, because the earth remained during twenty-five thousand years so much heated, as to convert water into vapor. It was only after this period, that water gradually descended upon the earth, and covered it to a height of twelve thousand feet, leaving no other part exposed than the summits of the highest mountains. The water gradually penetrated the interior cavities of the earth, and left its surface inhabitable. Owing to the high degree of temperature, the productive power was at first very great, and tropical animals were enabled to live in a high northern latitude. The polar regions cooling first, became inhabitable before any other portion of our globe; and as this cooling still continues, the earth will be unfit for habitation in ninety-three thousand years. According to the pious geologist, De Luc,† this earth was in the beginning a chaotic mass, which contained the elements of all mineral and organic substances now to be found upon it, partly in form of a mixture, partly in chemical solution. These elements could not affect each other, since the liquid portion remained torpid during the absence of light and heat. The creation of light, with which the fire of the earth combined,

\* *Histoire naturelle générale et particulière*. Tom. I.

† *Lettres physiques et morales* &c. 1779. 5 B. *Lettres sur l'histoire physique de la terre*, adressées à M. Blumenbach &c. 1779.

dissolved this torpid mass, and allowed its component parts to act upon each other. During the second period, the solid particles were precipitated, according to the laws of affinity, and formed the granite crust of the earth, while the expansive liquids united themselves with the atmosphere, leaving, however, under the granite, a stratum of slime, and a nucleus of dust-like particles. Over the granite, gneiss, wacke and slate were deposited from the water, which latter disappeared during the third period, amid the slime and dust, under the granite. The sinking of a portion of the firm substance, caused inequalities and caverns, the coverings of which again breaking in masses of great extent, caused water to collect, leaving other portions dry, by means of which the sea became separated from the land. Upon this, vegetation sprung up, whilst at the bottom of the former was formed what now constitutes our dry land, from the fragments of the broken primitive strata. During the fourth period commenced the decomposition of sun-matter combined with that of light; the light emitted was communicated to the earth, and through it, undiminished heat maintained. The population of the ocean and the deposition of limestone, in which we find the first traces of imbedded sea animals, are comprised in the fifth period of the creation. By repeated cavings, the position of the strata were changed obliquely, many new strata of limestone were formed, with petrefactions in great number; rock salt and sandstone layers were deposited, and volcanic eruptions made their appearance. To this period, probably, belong also the formation of gangs and metals. A sudden revolution, occasioned by the repeated breaking through of great masses, elevated the former bottom of the sea, and buried the dry land under water; the latter gradually receding into the subterranean cavities, left the land inhabitable. The filling of the earth with living races, was the last act of the creation. The deluge was at a later period occasioned by water, descending from the atmosphere, and also by gushing from subterranean caverns, carrying along in its course, and depositing the remains of animals of the primitive world, in such regions, where at present they could not live.

Let the above hypotheses, which belong to the last century, suffice; although we might add, as before remarked, a long list of celebrated names, such as le Grange, la Place, Franklin, &c. By consulting Munke, we will now have an opportunity of examining those hypotheses which also sprung up at the latter part of the last century, but which, at present,



have the greatest currency. It is well known that geologists divide themselves in two classes, viz: those who ascribe the process of the formation of the earth to the agency of water, the *Neptunists*, and those who believe fire to have been the chief agent, the *Vulcanists*. The former class take their origin from the celebrated Werner. According to Werner,\* the globe was originally composed of an aqueous, semi-fluid matter, from which were deposited, in successive periods, the different kinds of stone, in the following order: 1. The primary rocks, which consist in a series of stone, and are deposited as follows: granite, gneiss, slate and argillaceous schist. 2. The liquid lost in the former deposits at least one-half of its solid matter. 3. A revolution forced the water to a height equal, at least, to one-half that of the primary rocks, whence originated, by means of dissolution and washings, the transition rocks. 4. After this revolution followed a period of rest, for vegetation and animalization. 5. Another revolution among the liquid portion, destroyed part of the primary and transition rocks, together with all organized beings, and upon its ruins arose the secondary rock. 6. During the two revolutions, all the sand was formed from the tossed ruins of quartz rock. 7. Since the formation of the secondary rock, only local revolutions have taken place, produced chiefly by water currents, from which alluvial strata derive their existence. 8. Crystalization, which was prominent during the formation of granite, gradually decreased, which explains the laminated character of later formations. 9. Basalt was the last production occasioned by inundations, which covered the already formed rocks.

Hutton, who represents the Vulcanic theory, opposes the Neptunic, especially on the following grounds: There are pieces of fossil wood, which are petrified into flint, to a certain depth only, the remainder being unchanged. They can, therefore, not have been penetrated by a watery solution of flint-earth, since they would have been thoroughly saturated; consequently they were surrounded by flint fused by fire. Sulphur is found combined with metallic ores, in enormous quantities, especially with iron. If this combination had been brought about by a watery solution of both substances, sulphates would have been formed, and instead of pyrites, the product would have been sulphate of iron; we can there-

\* Kurze Klassifikation und Beschreibung der verschiedenen Gebirgsarten. Dresden 1787. Neue Theorie der Gänge. Treib. 1791.

fore think of but one combination of these substances in a fused state. Solid metals, so frequently found; pure manganese, as discovered in small bodies by la Peyrouse; crystallized natron, without water of crystalization, as found by Dr. Black, cannot have been watery fluids; nor can the deposition, one upon another, of spar, quartz, pyrites and other minerals, be explained in this manner.

All earthy substances, and especially those which form the constituent parts of granite, are so little soluble in water, that an almost unimaginable quantity of water would be required for their dissolution and subsequent crystalization. But to the adoption of a fluid produced by heat, much less objection is to be made, since the experiments of Dr. Beddoc prove that in a fusion of an admixture of earthy and metallic substances, it depends entirely on outward circumstances, viz: the time of cooling, whether it will resemble the very regular form of Basalt, or whether it will assume the very irregular character of granite; and even the porcelain of Reaumur, receives its crystalline structure from the slow cooling process of the fused glass. Finally, Hutton proves indisputably, that Basalt can have been only a dry fluid, from its peculiar character, as well as from the substances with which it is surrounded, since it is in every respect connected with lava. If this point be conceded, it follows clearly, from the extensive masses of this rock, found especially on the coast of Great Britain, and everywhere on the Continent, as well as upon numerous islands, that a great many changes have taken place upon the surface of the earth, by volcanic action, during an indefinite, but long period of time; and it is not supposable that the power which, in our time, continues to work so many violent destructions, should not have acted with much greater violence, especially at the beginning of the formation of our globe.

To Hutton's may be added the celebrated system of Scipio Breislak, which is laid down in his geology, and translated into German by Strombeck. According to his ideas, the liquid state of our globe was caused by caloric, and was changed into a solid, when *free* caloric became latent, on entering those bodies in which we now discover it. Thus the earth gradually cooled, and this process extending into the interior of our globe, formed strata, which being rent and cleft into chasms, caused immense masses to fall. The primitive ocean was originally hot, in violent commotion, and considerably higher than at present. It fell in consequence of the gradual

cooling of the earth, and the receding of water into subterranean, by bubbles formed, caverns. Primary rocks obtained their crystalline form from the action of fire; the transition rocks and coal strata certainly from water, the effective power of the latter being increased through the presence of caloric and chemical substances. This vulcanic formation of the primary rocks explains likewise, why no remains of organic matter are found in them, the germs of which could originate only at a later period, during the gradual process of cooling. Here let us stop and pass by other names. And what, we would ask, is then the present result of geology? In order to learn what views in the different branches of science maintain themselves on a level with the spirit of our time, we can consult no more reliable source than the work which professes to give the latest opinions of our time, and considerably aids in forming them, we mean the *Conversations Lexicon*, by Brockhaus. Here we find (seventh edition), on the formation of the earth, the vulcanic hypothesis (Breislak's system forms a long separate article) marked as the one now prevalent, as in fact it is adhered to by most geologists, the English perhaps excepted. But this decision in favor of vulcanism in general, signifies but little; for the opinions with regard to the *extent*, the *manner* and *time* of the coöperation of fire, are so varied, that it would be difficult to find individuals who agree in every particular one with another. The profession of vulcanism by many, signifies no more than an acknowledgment of the opinion that the Basalt and Trachyte rocks are vulcanic apparitions.

That organ, the representative of the spirit of our time, the *Conversations Lexicon*, wisely concludes to look to the future for the solution of those enigmas. "If we compare," it says, art. Geognosy, Ed. of 1830, "on one hand, the scientific necessity which seems to present itself in this (vulcanic) theory, to that which is diametrically opposed to the teaching of science, in Werner's (Neptunic), probability inclines more towards the vulcanic, than to the Neptunic hypothesis, *without taking that, however, as proved, because many of the enigmas cannot be solved which we find in the study of the details of the ancient foundation of the earth.*" In art. "Urwelt" we find: "Although the knowledge of organic remains is of great importance to the geological history of the earth, . . . we obtain only erroneous views, if we believe with some otherwise respectable authors, that the theory on the formation of the earth may be founded entirely upon

a basis which comprises so small a portion of the whole structure, and offers but very limited evidence upon many very important points in the history of the revolutions of the earth." One of our modern works on the same subject, (*Nat. Hist. of Man*, F. G. H. R. Wagner, Kempton 1832, Vol. II. p. 21) concludes with the following similar remarks: "If we calmly consider what truth modern Geognosy has added to the history of the formation of the earth, we feel constrained to confess that it is but little, and that all researches have, at present, resulted in hypotheses, the intenableity of which to prove, a new discovery of our time, often was sufficient. Important as the facts may be, and as much as the persevering industry of Naturalists has accomplished within the latter years; much as all this may fill us with astonishment, and teach and edify us; what does it all amount to, when compared to what remains hidden from our eyes? Humboldt attained, on the Chimborazo, to a height of eighteen thousand feet, and the deepest excavations or mines which are known, scarcely descend one thousand feet below the level of the sea; for the pits in the Tyrol and Friberg (Vol. I., p. 102) have their entrance so high above the surface of the ocean, that if we calculate their depths from the latter, there remain little more than one thousand feet of absolute depth; we may therefore say, that we are not acquainted with the crust of the earth, to the thickness of one mile, scarcely that of seven-eighths of a mile, if we allow twenty-two thousand eight hundred and forty feet, Parisian measure, to a geographical mile. The diameter of the earth having  $1718\frac{1}{2}$  geographical miles, and deducting the fraction for the known part, we have seventeen hundred and eighteen geographical miles, of which we know absolutely nothing, left for our investigation. A thin covering of dust upon a globe of ordinary size, would be in proportion, a much thicker crust than that of the earth, accessible to us. We should commit a great error, if we were to believe that we are sufficiently acquainted with all the strata, to a depth of nineteen thousand feet, or that we had dug down to that depth, at all places from the surface, or even at any one. It is well known that six million eight hundred thousand square miles of the earth's surface is covered by water, and that the land exposes an area of about two million four hundred thousand square miles; we are entirely unacquainted with the bottom of the ocean and the larger seas, and can form suppositions only, with regard to its character; we know but imperfectly a portion of

some mountains of Europe, of the north of Asia and of America; and very little of those in Africa and the East Indies, and even of the most explored part of the earth, of Europe, containing only about one hundred and fifty-four thousand square miles, one-half is almost entirely unknown to us, as regards the interior conformations; and in Germany, France and England, although each small province boasts of its zealous explorer of mountains, many large districts have been but superficially examined. With these scanty means, then, we have the confidence to attempt to throw a clear light upon the history of the formation of this planet, when in reality, but a faint glimmer has commenced to dispel utter darkness! Two decenniums have not elapsed, since granite was considered the undermost stratum of primary rocks, and it was considered a settled fact, that all other formations rested upon it; now, we know that it is found sometimes above, and sometimes under the old slate; that it even sometimes covers the old limestone, the red sandstone, and even the strata of lias. It is but a short time, when no one dared to entertain a doubt about the Neptunic theory, that granite was formed from the deposits of an aqueous solution, according to the school of Werner, until modern Chemistry pointed out the great improbability of such a formation, and showed, by means of fire, the possibility of producing similar results. Modern Geognosy made use of this; adopted all stratified rocks as Neptunic, and all unstratified, among which lava, which is certainly of Volcanic production, as of Plutonic origin, viz: formed by the agency of fire, in which granite was also included, it never being stratified. But in this they also encounter so many difficulties, that many experienced Naturalists, who cannot reconcile their views with the above, prefer to adhere to the former, when it would perhaps be better had they abandoned all. In fact, it is difficult to understand how granite could be formed by fire, and gneiss and mica by water, if we consider that those formations are formed alternately, and change from the one to the other, almost imperceptibly. Brongniart finds himself so puzzled by it, that he sometimes calls granite the oldest Neptunic and sometimes Plutonic formation."

With such admissions of the insufficiency of the researches hitherto made, the question, how far they disagree with the history of the Creation, as taught by Moses, will scarcely be asked. But what shall we say when the *latest* (eighth) edition of the *Conversations Lexicon*, makes the following ac-

knowledge (art. *Urwelt* p. 564)? "*The results which we may accept as firmly established in Geology, and consider as so much gain, their most contrary direction of explanations by Naturalists notwithstanding, already show the most perfect unison with the first book of Moses.*" (Compare Vol. II. p. 152, *Conversations Lexicon der neuesten zeit.*) Every one of the now accepted systems points to a struggle for supremacy between fire and water. Have not most of the present systems adopted the motto sung by the Psalmist after the Genesis:

Who laid the foundation of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever. Thou coveredst it with the deep as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountain.

At Thy rebuke they fled; at the voice of Thy thunder they fled away.

The mountains ascend, the valleys descend unto the place Thou hast founded for them.—*Psalm* 104.

To this compare Ps. 90: 2, in the original text:

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world whirling, &c.\*

All systems differ as to how the chaotic mass was made to produce, and how life was instilled, and we affirm positively, that all the modes they suggest are inadequate. Thus, may we really suppose that the act of calling the present sublunary world into existence, differs from any other physical experiment in nothing but quantity of material. Thus, then, every experimentalist may become a Creator, on a small scale, and the law of precipitation, which is illustrated by an experiment with a beer glass full of vinegar and chalk, by adding a quantity of sulphuric acid, which uniting with the chalk, causes precipitation, and forms gypsum; this, then, is the secret by which the world, with its valleys adorned in beauty, and crowned mountains, is called forth. And not only the formation of our own planet, we are enabled to imitate by experiments, but even the birth of those rare visitors who, terror-spreading, sweep through our planetary system,

\* Silberschlag already remarks in his *Geognosy*, § 74' how Moses, in accordance with Natural Sciences (and, we may add, with the record in Genesis) first names mountains, as having made their appearance. We might, however, with de Wette and others, make *וַיִּבְרָא* v. 2d the earth the subject, and translate: "Before the earth brought forth," viz: plants, animals. Thus the agreement with, 1. Moses 1. would be still greater.

the Comets, can by experiments, be done over before our own eyes, by the skill of an experimentalist.\*

Who would describe and study aught alive,  
Seeks first the living spirit thence to drive;  
Then are the lifeless fragments in his hand,  
Then only fails, alas! the spirit land.  
This process, Chemists name in learned thesis,  
Mocking themselves, Naturæ encheiresis.

Natural Philosophers, such as Steffens and Schubert, have indeed hinted at agencies and methods beyond the narrow horizon of experimental physics. Steffens says in a former work,† “It was the limited doctrine of precipitation, transferred from a narrow view of experimental chemistry into the history of the formation of the earth, which prevented Naturalists from uniting upon a common basis, for observations on the transformation of all elements. Innumerable varieties of the most heterogeneous substances, are to be dissolved in a fluid, the character of which no Natural Philosopher has described or conveyed a clear idea of in this monstrous supposition; or given an explanation of the manner in which the dissolution or the precipitation is to be effected.” Schubert says:‡ “The Naturalist finds in every earthquake, in every great Volcanic eruption, the limits of his narrow, one-sided theories broken; but he should not give up in despair, when it is of importance to attribute to surrounding nature an internal power and motion, which lie by no means without the analogy of his daily observations.” The Christian Theologian can, in fact, as long as Geology occupies no other than its present position, with regard to all hypotheses, make use of the proud language of Christina, Queen of Sweden, when abdicating her crown: *Non mi bisogna e non mi basta*—I need it not, and it is not enough for me. The Bible, in the history of the creation, mentions but one agency, the Spirit of God, big with life, hovering over the waters. This is all. Truly a poetic metaphor! But Natural Philosophers of the true kind, have acknowledged that, when on this sub-

\* Gruithusen: Ueber die Natur der Kometen, mit Reflectionen auf ihre Bewohnbarkeit und Schicksale, München 1811.

† Geognostische-geologische Aufsätze, als Vorbereitung zu einer inneren Naturgeschichte der Erde. 1810, p. 198.

‡ Die Urwelt und die Fixsterne, p. 9.



ject, they become poetical, in spite of themselves.\* If the poet is a ποιητής, then he is a creator, and construes the words of God, not according to scanty experiments, but in harmony with the Spirit, and through the Spirit, which in him descends from God, and testifies of God.

And what is the first product of that creative agency which rests upon the waters? Moses begins with *light*. We shall here not give a decision between the two main divisions of interpreters, the elder of which, considers that day's work as a description of a production of something absolutely *new*, or a *creation*, in the strict sense of its meaning; and the modern, which discovers in it only a representation of the gradual development of our earth, from its chaotic state.† Taking the interpretation of the former, it means here the creation of primitive light, which was communicated at a later period only, to the luminating bodies.‡ According to inter-

\* A. v. Humboldt, *Ansichten der Natur* 1. Bd. Vorrede S. VI.

† We find the names of the defenders of both theories, in Hahn's *Dogmatic*, p. 278. A very learned treatise on the history of the Creation, in accordance with the views of former Theologians, is to be found in the *Examen histortae creationis*, by J. H. Hottinger. Heidelberg, 1659.

‡ It is very astonishing that Theologians, nay, even Professors of Theology, in German lecturing chairs, when explaining Genesis, amuse themselves, year after year, at the expense of the ignorance in matters of Physic, of a so-called "Referee," who not even knew that light "comes from the sun." These enlightened Professors of Theology really know that light flows from the body of the sun. They who so much recommend progress, are, themselves, not far enough advanced, to know that scarcely a Schoolmaster educated in our Seminaries, could be found, who believes with Newton, that the sun is a ball of fire, and who know not that the sun, like the earth, is an opaque body, receiving its light from a surrounding light-atmosphere at a distance of five hundred miles; and that our earth depends not for light and heat on the body of the sun alone. If this is *terra incognita* to them, they can certainly not have heard how Herschel and Schubert find in the firmament of the fixed stars, the primitive source of light, whence it is distributed to all other bodies. But if those men would limit themselves to their Hebrew, and to the lines before their eyes, they might see that *וַיֵּאמֶר* verse 8, and *וַיִּבְרָא*, verse 14, although both are translated by Luther as *light*, have a different meaning. That the latter is intended for luminary, hence a body upon which light is found, is proved by 2 Moses 25: 6; and do we not find 1 Moses 14 expressly, "luminaries in the firmament of heaven, to divide the day from the night, and govern them." If we are inclined to amuse ourselves at this "Referee," his ignorance would only appear in that he considered the light and the sun as two different bodies—in which case modern Astronomers would be equally condemned—not, in that he was ignorant of the fact, that day and night depend upon the sun. To have arrived at this point of astronomical knowledge, of which those Professors of Exegesis of the Old Testament boast, a Hottentot or a Peshera

preters of the second class, light means the ray of light which gently begins to penetrate darkness through the thick watery atmosphere, mixed in a chaotic manner with the lower waters, whilst the luminating body of the sun remained yet for a long time hidden from the eye. It is frequently the case with discrepancies among expounders of the Scriptures, as it was with the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems; the one makes the sun move around the earth; the other the earth around the sun; both calculate eclipses of the sun and moon, and arrive at the same result. And it is upon the result that all depends. What this light may be, whether it be the first primitive light, which came in contact with the atmosphere of the earth, without being yet connected with the solar bearer, or the ray of our sun, which acted upon the chaos between the heavens and earth, it remains important in the highest degree, that light is presented as the beginning of the *αἰώνας*, on the first day, that marvellous, mysterious substance, of which we do not yet know, whether to place it in the world of spirits, or in that of bodies, which glides through creation like a mediating genius, between the world of spirit and of matter, full of vital power, and yet so still and gentle. Heat certainly participates largely in the vivifying efficacy of light, and it may be considered as proven, that light can claim in the production of bright heat, only *paternal*, and not *maternal* activity. But even then, the light of the sun, as is well known, is one of its important factors. How creative is the influence of light, how infinitely various its chemical and dynamic effects! The roots of the plant tend toward the darkness of the earth, as their proper place of nativity, as also the embryo of animal life, comes forth from the darkness of the womb. The conception and first beginning of living formation, seeks darkness, as it was the primitive chaotic state of the earth, in which fructification was effected through the Spirit of God. But for development, growth, refreshment and beauty, all living beings require light. Colorless and pale remains the plant from which light is withdrawn, and winding its way through crooked channels, it will meet light, where a ray finds its way through a hidden cleft; none but the pale, repulsive genus of fungi and its kindred, retire from

might equally be proud. But if ever it should enter the brains of any human being, that in the morning when the sun rises above the horizon, his light and blessings are by accident only punctual in accompanying it, we say, it will be in the head of some bookworm, rather than in that of a Hottentot or Caffir.

the light; pale and sickly remain animals and human beings—although they are less dependent on the influence of light, than vegetating organization, owing to the element of life gushing forth from within—when light is refused them; and the embryo, sprung from the darkness of a mother's womb, in every other respect passive, stretches and moves, animated by an irresistible love for light, towards the rays of the sun. Schubert's picture of what our planet would be without an atmosphere filled with light, is worth our notice. "Imagine," he says, "the atmosphere which surrounds with its life-producing power, all heavenly bodies that circle in our planetary system, to be removed, and there remain dark, dreary spheres, uninhabitable for living beings; spheres which continue their course, impelled by mechanical powers, (like a blinded horse, turning in endless circles around and around, imparting motion to some machinery) around a larger sphere, giving neither light nor heat; without an eye to perceive that motion; without the slightest trace of the silent march of time in the fruitless change of spring, summer and winter, left upon the naked skeleton of the earth. The waters of our globe, its compressing bands being removed, would partly evaporate, and yet more congeal into enormous masses of ice, so that no running stream, no breaking waves of the ebbing and flowing waters of the ocean, murmur a sound or give a sign of life, during this quiet, endless night. From the hidden depth of our earth, where there is room for such a motion, bodies of the nature of sulphur and the metals, might, by their union, vomit forth a gleam of light, destructive to every element of life; no volcanic eruption could even throw its light to the surface, upon the never ceasing, cruel, winter night, because that which generates and supports terrestrial fires, *air*, is wanting."

Who will not perceive with what profound truth the Mosaic account begins the order of created universe with *light*?\*

\* How much are the poor *studiosi theologiæ* to be pitied, who, since the time of Eichhorn, can see nothing in the creation of light, on the first day, but that our Lord wanted light at the creation, in order to see, and that for this purpose, he wisely created light. Is it to be believed that the heart and soul of a Christian, of a Theologian, could be made so insensible, as not to be able to find anything else in these words! What is meant in the Hindoo history of the creation, where in the first book of the *Mānavadharmasāstra*, we read: "This was (around) wrapped in darkness, indiscernible, undivided by signs, undistinguishable, and not one thing to be known from another, as if buried in sleep thoroughly. Then appeared Svajambhū (God) the exalted, the uncreated, He

*II. The Extinct Races of the Primitive World.*

Everything we see upon and above the earth, is wonderful; supported by life, full of life. Nowhere, as far as the eye surveys, a space destitute of life! We cannot refrain from presenting here the beautiful picture by A. v. Humboldt, in his treatise: *Ideas on Physiognomy of Plants*. "If man, with active mind explore nature, or in his fancy measure the vast space of organic creation, among the many impressions he receives, there is none so powerful, so deep, as that produced by the fulness of life extended everywhere. Everywhere, even at the icy pole, the air resounds the song of birds, or the humming of swarming insects. Not only the lower regions, in which the heavy vapors are suspended, but also the upper, the ethereal pure, are filled with life. For, ascending the Cordilleras of Peru, or climbing, south of lake Lemán, the summit of Mt. Blanc, animals have been found, even in this dreary abode. Upon the Chimborazo, six times as high as the Brocken, we saw butterflies and other winged insects. Admitting that, carried thither by perpendicular currents of air, they are lost, and strangers in regions where the thirst for knowledge impels the careful step of man, their presence nevertheless proves, that the more pliable animal creation continues to exist, where the vegetable has long reached its limits. Higher than the peak of Teneriffe piled upon Mt. Ætna; higher than all the summits of the Andes, we saw above us the Condor, the giant among vultures, sailing through the air. Rapacity, and the chase after the fine-fleeced Vigunna, which, like the Chamois, herd together on the snow-covered grass plains, attract this mighty bird to these regions. And if the unassisted eye finds the whole atmosphere animated, it will, when assisted, discover more and greater wonders. Wheel-animals, Bracheons, and a multitude of microscopic animals, are raised upwards from the

who created it, the primitive source of all existence, endowed with omnipotence; he appeared, dispersing darkness. He who exceeds all imagination, spirit-like, uncreated, is eternal; he who comprises the existence of all beings, whom thought cannot reach; as such he appeared in his own personal glory." Was darkness here dispelled for no other reason than that "He who exceeds imagination, spirit-like," might be enabled to take a good look at his own works? "Oh fools and slow of heart," said the Redeemer to his disciples, when they not yet had his spirit. And here we might quote again:

Who would describe and study aught alive,  
Seeks first the living spirit thence to drive; etc.

drying waters, by winds. Without motion, and apparently dead, they float perhaps for years upon the air, until, reconducted to the earth by the dew, the casing that incloses their transparent, whirling bodies, is unclasped, and probably through the element of life, contained in water, new power to move is instilled. Besides the already formed creatures, the air contains countless germs for future development; eggs of insects and plants, sent upon their long fall-voyage by means of hair or feather-like corols. Even the fructifying dust, scattered by male plants when the sexes are separated, is carried to their isolated females, by winds and winged insects, over sea and over land. In whatever direction the eye of the Naturalist may penetrate, life, or the germ for life, is diffused."

Yes, as far as the eye can reach, life is everywhere. High above our atmosphere it is still, holy, quiet and unchanging; below, changeable, decaying, and yet in its decay, lovely; within our earth only dwelleth death; and not only are our beloved ones buried in it, deep below them, and high above them, in the strata of mountains, rest generations of another age. To antiquity this field was hidden, and there is but one allusion to this subject in Tertullian,\* one of the fathers of the Church. Since the seventeenth century it has been gradually explored, and now, the oldest of ancient lore lies open before us. As if the unmeasurable extent of the theatre of the world were a field too narrow for the exercise of human inquiry and thirst for knowledge, an abyss has been opened, and a Cuvier describes a Fauna of a perished world, and a Brongniart, Artis and v. Sternberg, a Flora. After exploring the facts to which we refer, we shall lay them before the reader, as found in the most important works on the subject.

As regards fossils of plants, not only all separate parts, such as roots, bark, trunks and leaves, have been found buried under the surface of the earth, but whole trees, nay, immense forests. Some of these forests are not petrified, but in the condition of plants, with bark, roots and limbs unchanged. Others are decayed and penetrated by clay, sulphuric acid, and sea water, changed into a brown earth. The strata of coal—buried remains of ancient forests, and former water

\* In the book: *de pallio* op 2, where he speaks of the infinite variety in the Universe, he says: *Mutavit et totus orbis aliquando, aquis omnibus obsitus: adhuc maris conchae et buccinae peregrinantur in montibus, cupientes Plutoni probare etiam ardua fluisse.*

and land plants\*—extend through Germany, France, England (in the south of Europe they are less developed), and Humboldt found them near Huanuco, in South America, at a height of thirteen thousand eight hundred feet, near the present line of eternal snows. In all countries we find trunks of trees and other portions, petrified into flint, jaspis, agate, &c. Many of the kinds of wood are distinctly to be recognized; and especially the Palm, a plant of tropical production, is found in northern latitudes, as in Saxony, Bohemia, &c. Besides these real petrefactions and uninjured plants, we find numerous impressions in stone, generally of plants, too tender to have withstood the effects of the great catastrophe. The best preserved, are the impressions of the Fern; but those found in France, England and the northern part of Germany, resemble those of the south. Between five and six hundred different species have been discovered, many of them similar to those of the present world, many more developed and of a more gigantic form, than those of our own time; by far the most numerous is the simple genus of Monocotyledons, whilst the more developed Dicotyledons, so frequently found at present, are more scarce; of dikotyledonic species, the cone-bearing trees, such as firs, pines, different kinds of taxus and junipers, are found in great numbers; but the simple palm of gigantic size, immense bamboos,† &c., are by far the most common. The entrails of the earth, in all countries, are full of petrefactions, incrustations and impressions of animal bodies, and now and then we meet with whole skeletons. In the Alps of Savoy, at a height of seven thousand eight hundred and forty-four feet, petrefactions of sea animals are found, and at Whitehaven, Cumberland, impressions of Fern have been dug up, from a depth of two thousand feet below the level of the sea. Especially numerous is the kingdom of the lower animals, the mollusca, snails, crabs and turtles; next the reptiles; twenty species of lizards, some of the immense size of a whale, seventy feet long; crocodiles have been found; whether snakes, is yet doubted.

\* As such they were recognized as early as the sixteenth century.

† Schubert, Nat. Hist. p. 283, makes the following thoughtful remark: "Science, judging from minutiae, perhaps places the Monocotyledons too far below the Dicotyledons, although, in real interior perfection they are as far superior to a great many of these, as the sensible, watchful Elephant is above the stupidly ferocious Tiger or Wolf; or as the, internally more perfect, Mollusca, without limbs, to the externally apparently, more perfect insect, with limbs.

Transition animals, beings in which the form and power of taking roots of plants, are combined with animal mobility; flower-like encrinites upon long knotty stems; that family of snails, "which, contrary to the ordinary course of nature, have their feet, yet new to the upward-striving animal form, on their heads, possessing body-like forms, in which the first sign of vertebra, the important distinction from the fishes, upward to the mammalia, shows itself in its first beginning; animals, then, which through the whole extent of the less perfect animal world, those without vertebra, already bear in themselves the seeds of animals of a more perfect nature, the vertebrata." Although some perfect skeletons of fishes have been found, and even some with their prey still in them, we possess mostly only impressions of them; and Cuvier states to have found at the bottom of Montmartre, some of the fleet denizens of air, birds. In all parts of the world that have yet been explored, an immense number of thick-skinned animals, of Elephants, Rhinoceroses and Mammoths, have been discovered; but our own domestic animals, the horse, ox and ass, are not wanting. Attention should here be called to the fact, that *ordinarily*, the bones of animals which belong together, lie not together, but are strangely mixed up or totally separated. The number of the already discovered and described animals of the primitive world, increases daily. Cuvier has described more than one hundred and sixty large fossil animals, of which ninety kinds are no longer in existence, and the remainder retain only a resemblance to those of our time. In all, we count four hundred and forty-five kinds of mammalia, birds, amphibious animals, and fishes; four thousand two hundred invertebrata, mollusca, crabs, insects, &c.; of plants, Brongniart gives, as stated, five hundred—five hundred and fifty. But skeletons have not only come from the lap of the earth; in northern Russia, the region where especially animals of the primitive world have been found in great numbers, parts of the Mammoth, (i. e. earth-animal) thickly covered with ice, with remains of flesh still on them, and even a whole Mammoth, partly devoured by animals, the neck still showing a long mane, and the skin stiff black hair, and a reddish looking wool, have been discovered.\* "What a strange mixture of animals," says the latest author on the primitive world, "presented in former times in

\* See the treatise on this subject, by Rüggerath to Cuvier, Vol. II. p. 3.



the neighborhood of Paris! A sweet water lake, upon the dry bottom of which now stands the imperial city, with its palaces; the stones even, which include the remains of those animals, with additions of streams and rivers, then filled the bed of the Seine. Upon its banks, in forests of palms and pines, graminivorous Palaiotheries and herds of twenty other Pachydermes in search of food; rodentia and carnivora, even the Musk animal, now to be found only in New Holland and South America, but like other species, then natives, were mixed among those grotesque figures. Land, swamp, and water-birds animated the air, and in the lake and rivers lived crocodiles, turtles, fishes and muscles. But a storm swept over this peaceable community of animals; the infringing waves of the ocean buried all the living, and from its depth a new population sprang forth."

The ancient archives now lie opened before us; but to understand them, diplomacy is required. Which now is the diplomacy that will lend us the key? Various diplomatists have approached these ancient and honorable books of record, and explained this or that, most wonderfully strange. Among all Naturalists, however, not one—be it said to the shame of the Protestant church—has done as badly as that minister of the Protestant church, that preacher of Brunswick, Ballenstedt. Let us hear first what this man has read in those records of nature. We render it as near as possible in his own words, for his manner of reasoning, and his expressions are characteristic; compare Vol. II, *Die Urwelt*, first section: the origin of the formation of our earth; and Vol. I, eleventh section: "The deluge is not the common tomb of the primitive world."

"The origin of all things must be God, (however unpleasant it may be) for an effect producing cause must be acknowledged, which has given the first impulse to creation, and set the forces of nature in motion. Our globe was probably, as we may conclude from circumstances, in a soft, fluid condition. In this pulpy mass, the primordial fluidum, as Naturalists call it, everything was mixed, which is now separated, and in it were contained all elements. How was this pulpy mass changed into a solid body? How were formed the mountains, the fertile soil and the organic productions? All this could not have been done in a few days or hours, much less all at once, or even created out of nothing; it required, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of years, and even at present is this operation of nature not accomplished. (To these

men the word of God is as nothing, for it cannot be . . . Such manifest philosophers were already known at the time, when Plato composed his dialogue, *Sophistes*.) We might adopt four, five or more periods, through which our globe has passed, before it became what it now is, and each period must have occupied a succession of many thousand years. The latest Naturalists, such as Buch, Engelliaed, Heine, Raumer, Hausmann, Parrot, will not admit these periods. They insist that other kinds of mountains as e. g. clay slate, trappe, &c., are partly as old as granite, as the Alps and other high mountains show; that precipitation from water did continue, after transition rocks were already in existence, and that consequently, the formation of granite, gneiss, syenite, &c., has taken place alternately with the formation of other mountains and rocks. They say, we cannot fix a definite period for the formation of mountains. I shall not deny this entirely, since it is based upon undisputable experience (really an unpleasant circumstance), but both opinions may be made to harmonize, *de potiori* (*a potiori*, as others would say) *fit denominatio*. There must have been main epochs, during which mountains were formed, conceding that nature, disregarding of time and circumstances, changed alternately the formation of her products. The third organic creation did not make its appearance until the waters of the ocean had generally receded; and fully developed animals and plants were products of the fourth period. As regards their colossal forms, it seems as if nature had first made a trial on a large scale, with these unlikely shaped forms of animals; it may be perhaps also, that the productive power of nature in the primitive world, was greater and stronger than now, whilst the earth was in its youth and full strength. Suddenly the sun's course became oblique, (meaning the oblique direction of the ecliptic) either by coming in contact with a comet, or through the sinking of large masses of land, near the South Pole. By this was, of course, created a great revolution upon the earth, of which an inundation was a natural consequence. The earth, covered with water, formed now but one vast ocean, by means of which a new surface was formed. Not until now, during the fifth period, men and animals like the present, were created. Parrot says, in *Physics of the Earth*: "that the large mounds of bones found on the franco-spanish coast, are probably the remains of some large species of monkeys." *Is it not possible that this was the man of the primitive world, who approached more the monkey than man?*

(p. 18) Through the diminished perpendicularity of the earth, with regard to the sun, and through a decrease of its internal heat, the temperature became so uncommonly cold, as to either kill the animals and plants of the much warmer primitive world, or to cripple them, if they were not entirely destroyed by water. The new products are more tender, more beautiful. The earth had received, during this long period, and by assistance of so many revolutions, that degree of perfection which was required for the production of the present animals and plants, and man, as he now is, entered the ranks of created beings. During the primitive world, he could not yet attain this degree of perfection and cultivation, *because circumstances did not admit of it* (this might be called a philosophical because). According to all antecedents, we may conclude that that catastrophe will not be the last. There is, to be sure, not much consolation in knowing that our present beautiful world, and all that is living upon it, will perish and be buried some day, deep under water. But this cannot be helped. *We cannot rely upon an uninterrupted continuance of the surface of our earth; for the theatre of the world changes continually* (another philosophic for). Although the flood, at the time of Noah, commonly called the Deluge, is defended by the greatest Naturalists of their time, such as Scheuchzer, Gissner, Haller, Valerius, Fabricius, Deluc, Silberschlag, and others, it may, nevertheless, for the following reasons, be held that this flood was neither universal, nor caused a destruction of the primitive world. A universal flood would have upset everything on the earth, but instead, we find regular strata upon its surface, for the formation of which, centuries must have been required; and also frequently a heavy stratum deposited upon a lighter one. Would not the contrary have taken place during one violent inundation? The secondary limestone rocks, which are said to be products of the Deluge, contain a world of sea-animals and shellfish, settled down in banks, like oysters in the ocean. Were not centuries required to form such mounds of shells? But the most peculiar feature is, that we find under the former bottom of the sea, the bed of a river, containing products of sweet water. Is not this clear proof, that the earth has constituted, at different times, alternately the bottom of the ocean, and the dry land? It is not very long since the flood of Noah; how can any one imagine the world at that time, to have possessed entirely different animals and plants,

than now? It is reasonable then to suppose, that the flood at Noah's time, was only partial."

It is easily understood how such things, represented here with so much confidence and boldness as the latest results of scientific researches, and apparently entirely based upon facts, should produce so great a sensation among the mass of his contemporaries. It was discussed in all periodicals; inquiries extended even to Gymnasiums,\* and soon Pastor Ballenstedt was quoted in dogmas, by Professors of Theology, as authority in history of the human race. (Wegscheider's institutiones § 98) It is always the case, that, in the province of sciences, of which we know least, we remain most dependent upon authority. Buttman, the Philologist, in his Mythologic treatise (Vol. I. Mythologus) adopts without any farther inquiry, Vater and de Wette as theological authority; and equally, the historian Leo, in his history of the Israelites, takes Vater, de Wette and Gesenius. Consequently, it was very reasonable, that Theologians should the more implicitly rely upon the statements of a fellow-Theologian, the less they were acquainted with natural sciences. The author of this remembers many instances, when well meaning clergymen, at that time, with much embarrassment inquired, What can we answer? Facts have been adduced! The impression made by this book must have been the greater, if, as was the case with many, it was known by reputation only, and not from inspection of the title-page; that it was published by Basse, Quedlinburg, and that neither style, nor argumentation, nor the references of the author were known. This impression was, however, considerably diminished, when the great want of cultivation of the author became manifest, which showed itself so glaringly in faults in orthography, badly constructed periods, and in blunders in history, geography and philology; but still more, in the surprising mistakes in that science, of which he made profession, that of geology; citing as references for his "Urwelt," instead of respectable names, the "Journal for the elegant world," the "Independent," "Kotzebue's literary conversations," "Westphalian Monitor," "Youth's Journal," "Bertuch's Pictorial," &c., &c. When the author with a sigh exclaims, Vol. II. p. 55: *quantum est quod nescimus!* it is probably, to judge from his otherwise pompous language, *pluralis majesticus*.

\* We might name instances, where Ballenstedt's Urwelt was placed by teachers at Gymnasiums, in the hands of scholars, and to them recommended as an excellent book.

It would have been the duty of some Theologian, to oppose that fabrication of ignorance and arrogance, by some special and solid work; but besides a short, too aphoristic criticism, by some respectable geologist (Evangelical Church Journal, 1827, Nos. 13 and 14), only two small polemic essays appeared, cleverly written in spirit and substance, well deserving notice.\* That in which he coincides with modern Professors, we shall consider afterwards, and likewise in a separate article, his extravagant assertions in regard to the age of the catastrophies and the earth itself. But let us begin with that in which he stands alone, and what especially produced so much eclat, his assertions about Preadamites: "If, as is

\* On Ballenstedt's *Urwelt*: A word of candid examination, and an attempt at saving the honor of the most ancient history, by a Prussia-Saxon country pastor. Nordhausen, 1825. This book is written with understanding, judgment, and much modesty. The other treatise deserves this eulogy a little less: Reply to the question: Is a universal inundation of the earth a *mathematical impossibility*? Bretschneider's *Sendschreiben* to a statesman. Halle 1830. In the main points of this reply, the author is right. Both of these should be read by Theologians who take an interest in the subject. Bretschneider has, among a variety of questions, how and whither Theology could escape, to be saved from modern sciences, also the following: If in the opinion of the ancient world, which only knew the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, the Deluge was considered universal, having covered all mountains of the earth; and the reception of a few pairs of all animals, in the ark, was considered possible; then, a universal flood, submerging all mountains, is now, a *mathematical impossibility*, since we know the whole globe, and the laws of the elevation of the ocean. And how can a Theologian prove that animals found only in America, or in Africa, or in Australia, or in the Polar regions, should have found their way to Noah, in Asia Minor, to be by him admitted into the ark, and in spite of the difference of climate, to be fed; or, how afterwards, they have returned to their native countries." Our author enters not upon the latter question, but he might have propounded to the Superintendent General, who has so many questions to ask, a few by way of return; as e. g. How does the Superintendent General know, at a time when, according to the opinion of most Natural Philosophers, a uniform climate prevailed upon earth, as can be proved by Palms, Elephants, Rhinoceroses, &c., found in nearly every portion of the globe; animals with their necessary food, to have been distributed climatically? How can he explain, that a general presentiment of an earthquake—of which man has no perception—causes cattle, asses, dogs, and cats, to seek the open fields for safety; and how can he prove that a similar presentiment of the great catastrophe, was not operating upon them? By what right demands that Theologian, that, during a catastrophe of such awful grandeur, things should have happened as they did yesterday or day before. And as far as the *mathematical impossibility* of such a submersion by water is concerned, we suppose he will not disdain to be instructed by such men as Cuvier, Buckland and Humboldt, if he has learned nothing from the anonymous voice in that little work.

but right, we make man appear during one of the last periods, because everything in nature approaches gradually to perfection, and nothing is hurried; yet many remarkable traces and appearances of the early existence and cultivation of mankind, give tolerably clear evidence that man must be older than is generally believed." "The entrails of the earth, if we uncover them, prove that they must have suffered great and universal revolutions, during the existence of man, of which history knows nothing, and can know nothing, and which we cannot ascribe to what is called the Deluge. The various surfaces found upon the earth, which have been uncovered here and there, give evidence of cultivation, and prove that the earth has been inhabited by man, more than once. Near Langensalza, in the Duchy of Modena, and near Hanover, three different surfaces have been discovered, lying from twenty to forty feet, the one above the other, and each of which contains traces of cultivation. "Whence, it is asked somewhere, (in the *Youth's Journal*, 1811, No. 35) the strata, leaves of trees, bark, roots, petrified ears of corn, kernels of plums, skulls, &c., found near Langensalza, if these strata had not formerly been a surface, and afterwards covered by other layers?" Whence, I add, skulls and productions of agriculture upon these former surfaces, if there have been no men? Whence an iron ring in the bituminous wood of the primitive world, of which *Wendelstedt* speaks? If there were no men in the primitive world, who were able to make such products of art, whence came a wooden box with iron bands, attached to a beam, in a rock of the Caucasian mountains, which being burst open, was accidentally discovered and minutely examined by a traveller, if there had been no men to make this box with its iron bands, before those rocks were formed? Whence came the anchors found upon the highest mountains of the earth; rings on rocks, for fastening ships, where no water is to be found at great distances; stone bridges in the Alps, to which neither road nor path leads; the artfully constructed roads in Switzerland, conducting to precipices? How did they happen to discover at Faluhn, in Norway, in one of the mines, a haven with ships?"\* Then follows an enumeration of discovered human bones, and an argument from the Zodiac at Tentyra, which

\* Our author says, that he learned the factum of the iron box from a voyage to the Caucasus, the name of the author of which, he has forgotten; but about the discovery in the Swedish mines, he seems to have forgotten both author and book, since he gives references to neither.

is to indicate an age of fifteen thousand years; and from the temple at Ellora, in India, which was built, *according to the annals of the Brahmins*, eight thousand years ago.

With regard to the assertion of human skeletons and single human bones of the antediluvian world, having been found, all men of science agree that they have no certainty whatever, that such exist. The celebrated author of a work on petrefaction, v. Schlotheim, stated, and apparently proved satisfactorily, to have found in the valley of the Elster, among the bones of land animals, also bones of human beings; and Link, Schubert and Steffens, adopted this discovery. But in the appendix to that work, in 1822, v. Schlotheim withdraws his former assertion, for the reason that among bones evidently belonging to the primitive world, as that of the Rhinoceros, many bones of animals belonging to our present creation, were mixed; and as this has never been known to be the case in other localities, it follows that the gypsum caverns at Köstritz, have been repeatedly filled by later floods, and thus the remains of ancient and comparatively modern time, have been brought together with remains of animals of our own day, and with human bones, the dimensions of which vary not in the least degree from those of the present time. And with regard to those works of art of the primitive world, it is really to be regretted that the researches of the Brunswickian Pastor have not extended a little farther, in order to have furnished us a few more accurate items of the degree of cultivation of those children of the primitive age, like Gruit-husen of the children of the moon. We are told in Trebra's Cabinet of Minerals, Clausthal 1795, p. 64, that a peasant at Seppenrode, in the Harz mountains, dug up from his garden, anno Dei 1782, a flint, having not the slightest sign of being damaged. But—oh! wonder—when broken, nineteen pieces of silver coin, with the coinage stamp of the Archbishop of Münster upon them, fell to the ground.

*Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna;*

*Jam nova progenies coelo demittitur alto.*

Respect for the Bishopric of Münster, whose existence dates far beyond that of Jesus Christ! If pastor Ballenstedt would just commence his researches in the neighborhood of Rome, in the Travertin quarries, one might promise, supposing him to be also fond of the sweet comfort of country pastors, the herba Nicotiana, the prospect of a joyful discovery from the primitive world. It might not be altogether impro-



bable, to find a tobacco pipe of an inhabitant of the primitive world! It should not be mentioned, however, in his "Urwelt" that those quarries are formed so readily, and in so short a time, that perchance one of the Roman workmen, yet living, might claim of the Pastor the pipe, as his property.\* But what can we say, if we find in a clergyman the same preposterous conjectures of some perverse Natural Philosophers, that man has his origin and is descended gradually from the monkey. This unfortunate idea we meet, alas! not very seldom. We once heard a society of pedagogues make the following deduction: according to the *generatio aequivoca*:† organic nature is formed from inorganic, and without doubt, this extends also to the human family, hence from the slime upon rocks, which raise their heads above the ocean, first moss sprang up; from moss gradually the mollusca; from these still onward, the monkeys; from these but one step to the negro and *finaliter*—to a European Savant—very naturally! It would perhaps be well to mention here, as a barrier against an irruption of that kind of philosophers, that even Anatomy points, with all the similarity between the construction of the human body, (even in the formation of the brain), and that of the monkey, to very important dissimilarities; the head is placed vertically upon the spinal column, and the hands are not formed for walking, but for seizing;‡ the feet for

\* How men of science proceed, at a discovery of objects of human art and skeletons in caverns, which otherwise bear marks of the greatest antiquity, we learn from Buckland, who, in the cavern of Paviland, among remains of Elephants, &c., found a female skeleton, with some cooking utensils; but far from concluding, from this circumstance, to have discovered a *cook of the primitive world*, he made it probable that this female was a native of Britain, accompanying the armies fighting against the Romans.

† Compare to this clod-risen and all its earthy weight-retaining theory, that, through ether sounding, winged word of the excellent Schubert, in his *History of the Soul*, Vol. I. p. 23: "There is no transition. Night which overshadows the surface of the earth, would never cease to be night, if not the sun, from above, carried day into the northern winter and into darkness of night." A deepsighted, clever Naturalist, *Berzelius*, has shown by the overwhelming weight of experience, that "that *something*, which we call *life*, lies entirely beyond the limits of inorganic elements." In fact, he who wishes to create light from lessened darkness; or, from an operation of inorganic elements, produce a world of life, is like that countryman who (by Hans Sachs) attempted to breed calves from cow-cheese.

‡ It has become customary to include man, in natural histories, among the large class of mammalia, so that we may have the pleasure of find-

walking alone, and not for seizing. But it is difficult to reason with men, in whom reason is an unimportant ingredient.

Let us leave the Theologians, and direct our attention toward Natural Philosophers. One of the first, who occupied themselves with the primitive world, was the pious Physician and Professor of Mathematics, Scheuchzer,\* at Zurich, during the first part of the last century. This, in his sphere, very remarkable man, whom Brongniart pays the compliment to have given, in his *herbarium diluvianum*, descriptions and representations of antediluvian plants, which leave nothing to desire, had made it his favorite occupation, to apply his knowledge of nature to an explanation and justification of the Holy Scriptures. (Besides the work already mentioned, there are: *homo diluvii testis*, and *piscium querelae et vindiciae*.) The most prominent monument of his labors, the *physica sacra*, appeared first 1727 and '28, large fol., Latin and German, revised and edited by Martin Miller, Augsburg 1731, known among us as an unfinished synopsis by Donat, publ. by Büsching 1777, 1 Tom in three Vols. quarto, which contains the chief part of Donat's collections, but comprises the five books of Moses only; it is a book deserving commendation, in which much useful information may be found. Scheuchzer, like all Physicians of that period, relied upon the subterranean remains of a destroyed world, as his strongest proof of the Deluge. The Mineralogist, Gottlieb v. Justi was among us Germans probably the first, who deduced from organic remains, as well as from the condition of mountains, a system approaching that of Ballenstedt, totally opposed to the information of the primitive world, given by Moses. (History of the World, deduced from its external and internal conditions, 1771.) According to his views, the condition of the earth indicates an age of more than one hundred thou-

ing, in alphabetically arranged nomenclatures of animals, the genus *man* before meal-worm and mouse; but we might honor our own genus so much, as not to include it among the *quadrumanis*, with the monkeys, but among the *bimanis*, as Blumenbach has done, from the peculiarity of his hands. In a late collection of the *dicta of great men*, alphabetically arranged, we find in friendly companionship: Hosea, Hufeland—Jesus.

\* In yet earlier times, the bones of mammoths have received peculiar honors. The citizens of Lucerne have in their escutcheon, two supposed owners of some mammoth bones, discovered 1577; whilst their Anatomist, Felix Plate, proved that they belonged to a giant nineteen feet high, of the primitive world, the Landamman Engel discovered in these bones the remains of a fallen Angel, who inhabited this earth before Adam.

sand years, several changes of the land and the bottom of the sea, several populations of the earth with new inhabitants, &c. The eccentricities of which he was guilty, created more astonishment than lasting effect. The first less arbitrary treatise on this subject, in our own time, is that of Blumenbach, (with him de Luc, Reinhart, Förster, Rosenmüller):—*Specimen archaeologiae telluris terrarumque imprimis Hannoveranarum*, Vol. XV. comment. Götting. p. 133. He already distinguishes: 1, now existing organic remains, which have perished at the places where they were living; 2, fossils, the types of which still exist, but which have been carried by a flood from the original place of their abode, to some other; he disputes the discovery of human bones, as stated by Haller; 3, fossils of the animal kingdom which belong to a much older period, and which possess so many peculiar, distinctive marks, as to make it very doubtful whether they belong to genera of animals of the present time; they probably lived in the regions where the remains were found; 4, fossils which indicate that the greater part of the earth's surface was covered by water. As historians divide time into mythical, heroic and historical, so may we, it appears, class the two first named divisions, into the historical, the third into the heroic, and the fourth into the mythical. For to this fourth class belong those fossils which serve to prove that our globe has passed through a revolution that changed the bottom of the ocean into dry land, and the land with its forests, into the bottom of the ocean. These protogeic remains differ so widely from the present objects of nature, that they appear to belong to a world entirely different from ours; but they are so distinct from each other, according to the strata to which they belong, that we may be led to believe that several revolutions have taken place, for the chronologic classification however, an Oedipus has not yet appeared. Since it is not to be denied, that some of these remains resemble products of the present time, the question arises, whether we may believe that a few specimens of that primitive age have escaped the great catastrophe, the progeny of which now continue among us; or whether, which appears more probable, after all plants and animals had perished, nature has reproduced some specimens, similar to those that had perished. With this exposition, compare Blumenbach on this subject, Vol. I., Contributions to Natural History. Among modern Naturalists, the most celebrated who have given their opinions on the same subject, are v. Schlotheim, Link, Cuvier,

Buckland and Wagner. The explanation of the latter is more negative—also that of Carl v. Raumer—he says: Natural sciences have not matured sufficiently, to give a decision. The opinions of the others we shall review here. Their moderate hypotheses shame those of the clergymen.

Link, in his "Urwelt," premises, that the remains in the interior of the earth, cannot possibly be alone explained by the Deluge; "for," he says, "it is obvious that man, for whom that punishment was intended, and whose presence could have better testified, than anything else, is found among those remains very rarely, if ever." The Deluge appears to him, however, as a historical fact. Speaking of this, he remarks, Vol. I., p. 310: "The tradition of a Deluge that extended over the middle part of Asia, which we find related in many different ways among the various myths and traditions of nations; the appearance of a lake of salt water, however little salt it may be, viz: that of the Caspian sea, is very remarkable, and seems to indicate an irruption of the ocean. The elongation of the Mediterranean into the Black and the sea of Azof, pointing toward the Caspian, show the direction of the flood, and the great plain between the rivers Don and Volga contradicts not the supposition, that the Black sea once was connected with the Caspian. Powerful torrents of rain combine with occurrences of this kind, which are seldom free from Volcanic and electric commotions; the sources of the deep pour forth their waters, when the flood in the adjacent ocean is greatly increased. The ancients considered the Straits of Gibraltar, a breach of the great ocean, which formed the Mediterranean, and the form of the rocks near the strait, the mountains surrounding and limiting the Mediterranean, agree and give great weight to that opinion. The Caspian sea lies deeper than the Black; consequently the water remained in it after it had run down from the higher plain, between the Don and the Volga. The pressure of the rushing water alone, was sufficient to raise a mass of itself, great enough to fill the deep of the Caspian sea, if pressed forward over the plain. In this direction only, could the ocean open a passage into the interior; in nearly every other mountains obstructed its progress, although it may have formed, for a short time, a few bays, as Egypt, or the plain at the mouth of the Danube, or near the point of the Adriatic. Thus the condition of the countries, harmonizes perfectly with the description by Moses, especially if we translate it from the poetic language of antiquity, or rather the youthful

world, into poetry (prose) of later days. The whole occurrence belongs to history, and not to the primitive world; if the countries which were inundated by the Mediterranean, were peopled, we will find human bones upon the bottom of that sea, but the ocean remained too short a time on its way to the Caspian and the newly made bays, to form there petrefactions of human bodies." The remains of organic bodies he ascribes to gradual revolutions from water, in the intervals of which, organic beings even changed their forms; and he points to America and Australia, which he considers to be later continents, where the productions "bear the distinctive impression of a youthful nature, in its excesses as well as in its undefined appearance." With regard to the distribution of remains among the various strata, Vol. I. p. 65, he says: "The assertion that petrefactions which are seen no longer among the living, are most frequently found in the lower and older strata, is in some respects true. The Orthoceratites are most frequently discovered in the transition Limestone of Sweden; the Ammonites, Terebratulites and Gryphites in the old secondary Limestone; but the petrified Coni and Cipraeae, of which we find many species in our oceans, are very rare, and only among petrefactions of the upper or new strata. However all rise to the latest strata; at Sternberg, in Mecklenburg, we find Ammonites, Cipraeae and Coni united in one rock; old and new formations mixed; *vice versa*, new formations descend to the oldest strata; the Corals in the transition Limestone, differ but little from ours, and fungus resembling forms, we discover in the marble of Blankenburg, and in other layers of similar age. The formation of the Belemnites differs more from the later formations, than the Orthoceratites, yet those are found in Gypsum, a much younger form of rock, and these in transition Limestone. Certain forms have only been lost in later times; others have been better preserved; and in this respect there are different degrees, since some of them have remained to our own time, others have ceased to exist earlier. Again, some forms are of later origin; they have been called into existence at a later period, or have developed themselves out of former forms, to which we must ascribe less permanency, than to those who have been preserved unchanged through a number of formations."

Let us now listen to Cuvier. From him we have received, especially, a more accurate statement of the relation of species of animals, to the strata in which they are found. "Pri-

many Granite rocks are without remains of organic beings. With the transition rocks only, appear the misshapen forms of animals, the Zoophites, Mollusca, &c., perhaps with them contemporaneously, bones and skeletons of fishes. The important strata of coal, the trunks of palm trees and ferns, of which the impressions have been preserved, contain no kind of quadrupeds, even not of the lower species of oviparous animals, although we must presuppose the existence of dry land, and of an atmosphere. A little higher, in the cupriferous slate, we detect the first traces of them, and they are quadrupeds, reptiles of the lizard family. Still a little higher, we find the Alpine Limestone, and above this the calcined shells, rich in Entrochites and Encrinites. Ascending still higher, through the sandstone, which only contains impressions of plants, we arrive at the various strata of Limestone, known by the name of Jura Limestone. Here the class of reptiles attains its greatest gigantic development. Among these, innumerable oviparous quadrupeds of all sizes and forms, have been found, and also, from discoveries in England, some small mammalia. We may suppose, however, that mountains containing them, owe their existence to some local generation, which must have taken place at a later period than the original formation of the mountain strata. In chalk and the different kinds of clay, which cover the upper part of them, as also in brown coal, I have discovered only crocodiles, and I have reasons to believe that the brown coal which, in Switzerland, contained the bones of Beavers and Mastodons, pertain to a later period. The first mammalia I discovered, were in strata above the coarse Limestone; and at farthest in those contemporaneous with them, the class of land mammalia begins to show itself.\* Nowhere, however, do we meet bones of human beings. All bones of our own species, that have been discovered in the above named strata, are mere accidental appearances, and their number is very small, which would certainly not have been the case, if man had been living in those countries where these animals existed. But where was, at that time, the human family? Have those countries which were at that period inhabited by men and animals, disappeared, sunk, like those that are now occupied by them, have become dry, and upon which a great inundation has exterminated the ancient animal kingdom?

\* v. Raumer introduces into his *Geography*, p. 350, beautiful fables on the formation of rock and organic remains, after Humboldt and others.

The study of fossil remains teaches us nothing of the kind, and in this treatise we are not permitted to look to other sources." Thus expresses himself that learned man, Vol. I. p. 325. He farther proves, Vol. II. p. 249, that a sudden, and not a gradual cause, has buried those animals, as follows: "The bones and ivory, which are found in such a perfect state of preservation on the plains of Siberia, have been preserved by the cold, which had congealed them; this generally arrests the effects of the atmosphere. If the cold had commenced gradually, those bones would have had time to become decomposed, and especially the softer substances with which they are still sometimes surrounded, as was the case with those that were found in warm and temperate climates. Especially would it have been impossible to find a mammoth, covered with skin and hair, preserved in the ice." Compare also Humboldt in his *Physiognomy of plants*, p. 187. "Trunks of palms, and skeletons of Elephants lie buried in the bowels of the earth, in northern Germany, and their position makes it probable that they were not drifted from the tropics northward, but that during the great revolution of our planet, the climate, and that by it conditioned configuration of nature, have undergone manifold changes." p. 263 Cuvier continues: "*I believe, therefore, with de Luc and Dolomieu, that if anything in Geology is firmly established, it is, that the surface of our earth has suffered a great and sudden revolution, the epoch of which cannot be distant much over five or six thousand years; that during this revolution, that portion of the land, upon which formerly man and the best known animals lived, has sunk into abysses, and entirely disappeared; and that this revolution has placed the former bottom of the ocean above the water, and formed the now inhabited firm land; that since the revolution, the small number of individuals who escaped the catastrophe, have multiplied and increased upon the new dry surface of the earth. But the countries now inhabited, which have made their appearance above the water, during the last revolution, were at a former period the dwelling place of animals, if not of men. Consequently, this land had at least once before been submerged by water, during another revolution, and if the various successions of animals whose remains we find, justify us in forming a conclusion, the earth has suffered from two or three irruptions of the ocean. With this result, as generally with Cuvier, v. Schlotheim declares to agree, in his work on Petrefactions, Introd. p. XI.*



We have to thank Buckland especially, for his very accurate examination of the latest strata, the alluvial, in which he has shown with great certainty, the traces of a last general inundation; and after him also Leonhard, Rozet,\* and

\* On this important point, the celebrated English Naturalist, has at present (1836) changed and proclaimed his opinion in the Bridgewater treatise: *Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology*. His two chief reasons are: 1, that the Diluvium cannot be explained from a flood, so quiet, and of so short a duration; 2, there should be found in it, fossils of human bones; 3, animals of extinct races could not be found with the remains of diluvial animals. Against the first of these reasons, an intelligent and scientific critic of Buckland's works (Lit. advertiser, 1838, Nos. 47-48) remarks: The possibility of a deposit of Diluvium, during a flood, that lasted only years, and not centuries, although of different duration in different locations, appears to him undisputable. He introduces, as an example, a combination, which nearly agrees with the Mosaic history. If the abode of men had been the southern lowlands of Asia, and Noah's near the Euphrates and Tigris, a flood flowing from the south, perhaps forming in its course the Persian Gulf, and occasioned by an upheaval of land in the South East, (Pallas thinks Australia) would exactly coincide with the biblical statement. The water must have risen slowly, if the land rose slowly, especially, if besides, it had gradually to break through other large tracks of land, (as in the given case through Malaya, the present Archipelagus, and the present Persian Gulf). The current came from the South, and upon the Highlands of Armenia the Ark was deposited. It could not have landed there, but from the South, if Mt. Ararat, the Caucasus, and Hindoo Koosh, had not been overflowed. That Mt. Ararat was *not* under water, is even indicated by the Bible, since it rests the Ark upon it, (it is not necessary to have been, nay, it could not have been, upon the summit) before the tops of the mountains were seen, (Gen. 8: 4. 5.) The waters remained, from the beginning of the flood, (Gen. 7: 11.) to the end, (Gen. 8: 4.) exactly 150 days or five months; from the 17th of the 2d month, to the 17th of the 7th month. From that time, it required 220 days (Gen. 8: 17.) to dry the plateau of Armenia. How many more than 370 days must have passed, before the Lowlands were free from water! During this time heavy deposits would have been made. Not only the cessation of rain, for it lasted only 40 days, (Gen. 7: 12.) nor the wind, (8: 1.) could have been the only causes of the water subsiding. If the water had broken its way through lower lands, it was arrested by the high walls of the Himalay, Hindoo Koosh, Ellorz and Ararat. We find them broken through to the South East of the Caspian sea, a torn Highland (Korassa) now in ruins, a desert with traces of the bottom of an Ocean (Hoffman description of the Earth I. 896, 916); farther on we meet the large basin of the formerly larger, Caspian sea, the level of which is below that of the Black Sea, as ascertained by late measurements by Russians. Its surrounding country consists, to a great extent, of new Alluvial deposits (Eichwald, voyage on the Casp. Sea, Stuttgart 1844, I. p. 53, 61, 87. A. v. Humboldt's *Fragments to Geology &c. of Asia*, Berlin 1832, p. 49). In that direction, water might lose itself. We find a very minute, and accurate criticism of Buckland's works by A. Wagner, (gelehrte Münchner Anzeigen) from which we shall make some more extracts. With respect

others. He shows that underneath the clay, sand, and gravel strata, which are washed off from mountains, by rivers and streams of the present time, and deposited in valleys and on plains, and form the so-called Alluvium, are found extensive deposits of masses, that have their own characteristic formation, entirely different from the more solid rock strata underneath them; this is the Alluvium. "This formation, composed of clay, sand, gravel and pieces of rock, which is found alike in all parts of the earth, bears everywhere distinct signs of a general and sudden flood, having penetrated from the north." He farther adds, (*Reliqu. diluv.* 226): 1, that all elevations are formed after this manner, and frequently present the same alternately projecting and receding angles, we observe along the course of ordinary rivers; 2, that ordinarily a number of small valleys is connected, until they finally terminate in a main trunk, that leads to the sea; 3, that the gravel, and pieces of rock, consist of fragments of adjacent, and at times also of distant mountains. In one respect he differs from Cuvier, viz: in the opinion that the last flood did not cover the highest mountains. He opposes this in the following manner: (*Reliqu. diluv.* p. 221) "1. The blocks of Granite, which were carried from the summit of Mt. Blanc to the Jura mountains, could not have been placed there from the highest European mountain to which they belong, if that mountain had not been submerged by water. 2. The Alps, Carpathian and all mountainous countries of Europe, which I have visit-

to Buckland's argument that animals of extinct races are found with diluvial remains, in the superficial strata of Diluvium, and again, diluvial animals in deep lying formations, he says: This is a fact; we find e. g. in sweet water lime in Anspach the bones of the Bear, the Mastodon the Rhinoceros, the Horse, as they belong to diluvial formations, and with them also, Palaiotherium; Palaiotherium and Choiropotamus are frequently found in bone-brecias; in the pea-iron of the Suabian Alps bones of Oxen, Bears, Rhinoceros, Mastodons, lie together, i. e. animals of the eldest Tertiary formation, with those of diluvial strata. (*Jäger on fossil mammalia of Wirtemberg, Stuttg.* 1835). What conclusion can we arrive at, from this fact, of finding mammalia of the Tertiary formation, side by side with those of the diluvian? That both belong to the same epoch, of which one class forms the beginning, and the other the end, viz. which comprises a period of time, beginning with animal creation, and ending with the Deluge. Local inundations, which may have deposited a great portion of the Tertiary rocks, and the general catastrophe, which may have also, here and there, participated in this formation, all found the same kinds of animals. Tertiary and Diluvial mountains, constitute, according to the opinion of Ref. but one geognostic formation; the former chemically combined, the latter mechanically composed.

ed, indicate by the form of their summits, to have suffered from the power of water, as much as the hills of the lower countries of the globe; and I found in their valleys, wherever space did admit, the same diluvian gravel that I discovered on the plains below, and which is very distinct from the post diluvian rollings of mountain streams. 8. Although in Europe, in the high gravel layers of the Alps, no animal remains have been found, in America, in the immense strata near Santa Fe de Bogota, seventy-eight hundred feet above the level of the sea, the Mastodon has been discovered, and Humboldt found a specimen of the same genus in the neighborhood of Quito, at a height of seventy-two hundred feet, near the Volcano Imbaburra. Finally, Capt. Webb bought bones of Chinese-Tartar horses and stags, which had been washed down from the heights of the Himalay mountains, and were, by the inhabitants, thought to be bones of demons, that had fallen from the clouds. The height from which they had come, was estimated at sixteen thousand feet." Buckland concludes: "*It is evident then, that at a time, when the earth was already inhabited, a flood must necessarily have swept over the highest mountains of our planet.*" To show in what estimation the current views are held, we will here also consult the arbiter of the opinions of our time, the Conversations Lexicon. After mentioning the views of Link, it adds:—"*This hypothesis of Geologists is subject to a by far not exhausted examination of the interior of our earth.*" And after the already mentioned remark, that we know too little of our earth to draw safe conclusions, it says farther: "Several very important questions, concerning the history of the formation of the earth, have not matured sufficiently, to be decided, viz: whether the fluidum that acted during the formation of the various strata, was the common ocean alone, or whether inner oceans, separated from the former, and composed of different chemical ingredients, had any part in it. The observation, by which the relation of organic remains to the various strata is decided, admits of some doubt of its applicability under all circumstances; but especially since it has been lately asserted that in America, remains of mammalia have been discovered in old red sandstone, which rests upon primary rock."

Before we now compare these views to what the Scriptures tell us of the Deluge, we wish to consider the *one* point: How can it be explained, that the northern regions, yea, the northern *especially*, are filled with those animals which now only

inhabit the torrid zone? During the sixteenth century, and still earlier, to the astonishment of the world, ivory was frequently dug up in England; it was declared to be some remains of Elephants that accompanied the Roman armies in Britain. But the Roman armies did not visit Siberia and America. It was then pronounced that they had floated from the waters of the South to the North. Whilst some Geologists admit an irruption of the ocean from the North, and others from the Southwest, Pallas and Förster, based upon the formation of the earth, when the masses everywhere press towards the North pole, and terminate towards the South pole in shaggy points, adopt a flood from the South, that floated Elephants from India to Siberia. But 1, this explanation can be satisfactory only, if we overlook that animals have been found, which differ entirely from the present; 2, although those Elephants of the primitive world approach in structure those of Asia, still they are distinct from the Asiatic and the African; 3, the bones found everywhere, show no signs of rolling, their projections being uninjured, retaining their tender parts, which would have been broken off by the slightest force; 4, the whole condition and manner in which these remains are discovered, indicate plainly, that the animals lived where their remains are found. The most remarkable fact connected with this, is the discovery by Buckland, in Kirkdale cave, York, the main features of which we here communicate. He found a cavern in the limestone, about twenty feet below the ground, closed by rolled stones, &c. In it there were teeth and bones of twenty-three species of animals, of the Hyena, Tiger, Weasel, Elephant, Horse, Hare, Rabbit, of Mice, Pigeons, Ravens, Larks, &c., but few of the larger bones remained unbroken; the others, and also those of the Hyena, were splintered. The greater number of teeth belonged to the Hyena, and from a calculation, there must have been two or three hundred of these animals. Buckland concluded from this, that the cavern was inhabited during a long time by these animals, and that the others, the remains of which he found, had served them for food. There were two circumstances which corroborated strongly the correctness of this opinion. All bones were splintered in a manner as is generally done by the bite of Hyenas, and on some, marks of teeth were still visible as inflicted by that animal. A Hyena in a menagerie, splintered the bones, in order to reach the marrow, in exactly the same manner. It is not to be wondered at, that the bones of the Hyenas were

likewise splintered, since it is well known that they are in the habit of eating one another. Besides there were small, firm balls of excrements, containing lime, such as are found of animals that live on bones, and some undigested fragments of the enamel of teeth. The keeper of the menagerie at Exeterchange, recognized them at once, by their form and appearance, as the excrements of the spotted Hyena. The cavern could not have held one-twentieth of the number of animals at the same time. But how did it happen, that these splintered bones showed not the least sign of having been rolled? It is just as improbable to suppose that these animals had sought a refuge in the cave from the approaching deluge, for their number contradicts this; and Elephants or Rhinoceroses could not have found room. There remains nothing to believe but that the animals lived here in the neighborhood, and that Hyenas brought their bones together.

We may consider it then as proved, that those animals and plants, now belonging to a warmer climate exclusively, were formerly distributed through all zones, even in the colder. And in order to explain this phenomenon, we have to choose between the following opinions: 1. One would have to believe that perhaps those animals and plants were so constituted as to live also in colder regions; that they may have been species different from ours, just as there is at present a kind of ox in America, as far north as the seventieth degree, and another in the hot climate of India; there may perhaps also have been a kind of Elephant and Rhinoceros, able to live in a cold region. This would appear more probable yet, from the heavy mane of the mammoth. Palms are found in Japan, and in southern Europe to the 39° N. L. Add to this that the extent of water was formerly greater than now, and that its temperature is more uniform than that of the land, which receives and loses heat much more readily. These are the remarks of Link, Vol. I. p. 69, and similar to Cuvier's, Vol. II. p. 238. The latter intimates in another place, Vol. I. p. 309, that a tropical climate must have extended all over the earth, and this opinion has become almost general. Against the opinion of southern animals having lived in a northern climate, the objection might be urged, that in a region bare of vegetation, no Elephants, and other gramnivora, could have existed, for want of food.

A great number of Naturalists adopt 2, the opinion of a variation in the position of the earth's axis; that the poles and the equator were formerly at other points than now;

against which may be objected, on the ground of the oblate form of the earth, which it must have received when in a soft, fluid state, and in the present position. Oken, in his *Manual on Natural Philosophy*, Vol. I. § 612, gives other reasons from the distribution of ores, over the whole earth. Much more common is 3, the adoption of a variation in the course of the sun, or rather of the earth, in its revolutions around the sun; that whilst now the ecliptic intersects the equator at an angle of  $23^{\circ} 29'$ , formerly it coincided with it. Placing the earth in this position to the sun, there would have been a continual 'spring upon the earth, but for this reason, in the northern regions the temperature could never have attained a degree of heat as now, during at least three months of the year. Supposing the temperature in the northern part of Germany to remain at  $8^{\circ}$ , Reaumur, and if it should even be raised a few degrees, by the unchanging high position of the sun, this would still not be sufficient for tropical plants and animals. We are reduced then, 4, to the view which Humboldt, Schubert and others advocate, that the earth, independently of the sun, had a much higher degree of temperature, which had its origin in the extraordinary development of heat which accompanied the precipitation of mountains.\* This explanation is, however, not sufficient, partly for other reasons, partly because the specimens we possess seem to have required a sudden change of temperature. How could we otherwise explain the mammoth retaining his flesh and hair, surrounded by a covering of lumps of ice? Here also we are without a key. Since we are directed to a very extraordinary event, the hypothesis of comets is still upheld by some Natural Philosophers. It is not necessary to imagine an accidental aberration of a comet from its orbit, but to adopt a predetermined approach to the earth, comprised in a plan of Providence, which would explain an inundation in a most natural manner. The comet of 1680 proves that the elliptic orbits assigned to comets, may bring them very near to our earth, since it approached to a distance of only ninety-six thousand geographical miles. If now a comet, of the size of our earth, should approach to within thirteen thousand two hundred and ninety miles, it would raise the ocean, according to Lalande's calculation, two thousand fathoms, adopting the same laws by which the moon acts upon the ocean; at the

\* Humboldt; The development of Caloric, considered as a Geognostic phenomenon.

same time it might produce an alteration in the position of our earth. The most simple way to find a reason for the former high temperature, would be, to look to the earth itself, in the interior of which, even now, a subterranean fire continues to burn with unabated fury; but as regards the reasons for a sudden cooling, we should have to acknowledge our ignorance.

Let us now examine what relation all these facts bear to the Bible history of the primitive world. In the first place, we again find, *that we are far from a fixed result*. For the relative age of the strata, and their relation to the remains of organic races inclosed in them; for the number of possibly repeated inundations; for causes of alternate layers of water and land products;\* for the extent of inundations; for the height of the ocean at that time; for the change of the temperature; for all these, men of science give us different hypotheses. What during one lustrum was received for truth, appears antiquated in the next following. The arguments adduced by Buckland, for the distribution of the alluvial, are not only rejected by the French Geologists, (Boué, Prevost, Elie de Beaumont) but as already remarked, the great English Geologist has himself altered his opinion. If, therefore, a respectable Mineralogist (Carl v. Raumer, in his *Universal Geography*, p. 352) closes his remarks on this subject, saying: "Would it not be better to relinquish the study of the mountain strata, that history of the development of organic nature, until we are prepared by a most thorough, searching and extensive knowledge of the present mountain systems, to resuscitate the myths of the past?" How can we blame a Theologian who confesses himself unable to answer all questions that may be propounded? We shall learn hereafter from the lips of Humboldt, that there are also "Geological Myths;" and we should be more cautious in receiving them for truth, than in attributing, from the beginning, too much mythus to Bible history.

Let us stop at present to examine the results arrived at by Cuvier, and inquire whether they stand in opposition to the primitive history of the Bible. Cuvier says: "If the various successions of animals justify us in forming a conclusion, the earth has suffered from two or three irruptions of the ocean." Modestly and doubting he places this factum before us; qualifying his conclusion, based upon the successions of

\* Munk in Gehler's Dictionary, Vol. IV. Sec. II. p. 1292.



animals by *if*; and how could he have done otherwise? Any newspaper may communicate a new discovery, which strikes at the roots of former results, such as the late news from America, of animal remains being discovered in Granite. But what could prevent those who defend the credibility of the history of the Deluge, as related by Moses, from conceding, that before the last great inundation, the traces of which are discovered in the Alluvium, the world has suffered several revolutions and partial inundations, and that large tracts of land, according to Cuvier, have constituted alternately, dry land and the bottom of the ocean? It confirms that for which the Theologian contends, the last general inundation. That this was a Deluge,\* as represented in the Bible, *seems* to be contradicted most effectually by Link, who remarks that he, for whom this punishment was to have been intended, *man*, is absent from the former scene of action. Was man really not in existence during centuries, when animals roamed over the wide surface of the earth? We have seen that Cuvier, and also Buckland, people the new continent with the few families that were saved of the original stock, and transplanted. With regard to the perished human beings, Cuvier remarks, that they probably extended only over a limited space, and their remains should be looked for in Asia. Buckland and Wagner, Vol. II. p. 101, agree with this. Instead, then, of impairing the credibility of the representation of the Bible, the fact of not finding human remains, is an important circumstance, and contributes materially to strengthen it; for according to the history of the Scriptures, we may not expect that the human family extended as far as Europe and America, the only two grand divisions of the world that have, to the present, been explored with some degree of accuracy.

There is another question of great importance. How is it to be accounted for, that animals and plants before the Deluge, appear in most instances, under wholly different forms, from the present. Has the voice of the Creator spoken more than once to the earth or ocean, to create life and animate its bosom, or have extinguished races been called forth from their ashes, similar but more perfect? If we were to concede this, we would arrive, it seems, to conclusions directly contradicting the Scriptures. This is not Cuvier's opinion, Vol. I. p. 117: "If I contend that the strata of solid rock contain the

\* The word Sünd-fluth (Deluge) is derived from sin fluth, i. e. a continued flood, v. Pishon Studies and Criticisms.

bones of a greater number of genera, and the alluvial the remains of more species which no longer exist, I do not express the necessity of a new creation, in order to produce the living races; I merely say that the latter live in different places from their former dwellings, hence must have arrived from other localities." He supposes, as the sequel shows, Europe, and the countries generally, where extinguished races have been found, to be inundated; and whilst these countries were becoming dry, other regions were inundated, and their inhabitants took refuge upon the dry continents. The improbability of this hypothesis is apparent. If Cuvier was unwilling to admit several creations, this was his only alternative; but he rejects in toto, the possibility of a change into a later, from a former form. He says: "However great in other respects, the influence of climate and habit may be upon animals, they cannot change their anatomy; and in it, especially lies the difference between animals of the primitive and the present world." To substantiate these views, he gives the results of his comparisons of the Egyptian mummies of animals, the Ibis, dogs, cats, monkeys, with those of the present generation, not finding the slightest difference. He draws the conclusion, that if no change has taken place during two or three thousand years, it is not probable that any should be effected in five or six thousand years, the time he fixes for the Deluge. It cannot reasonably be doubted, that *it is possible* to produce varieties or differences, in accordance with the known process of nature, such as we discover between animals of the primitive and present world. But we have already seen, that incidentally with the Deluge, another powerful influence must have coöperated, which changed the temperature. If this be the case, one of the greatest differences between the animals of the pristine and present ages, viz: the colossal size of the former, is explained. "The greatest number of animals of that age—Nöggerath, *Anm.* Vol. II. p. 248—are either like, or similar to those which now live in all, or most tropical countries." Humboldt in his work on the development of Caloric, already mentioned, says: "Favored by this increase of heat, the plastic powers of nature soon developed their energy. Plants naturally of a southern character sprang up." Again, in his *Physiognomy of plants*: "Size and development of organs depend upon favorable influences of climate. The small but elegant forms of our lizards, expand in the south to huge, scale-clad bodies of terrible crocodiles, &c. . . If the temperature of our globe





has undergone, perhaps periodically occurring changes; if the relation between land and water, and even the height of the atmospheric ocean and its pressure, have not always been the same, the physiognomy of nature, and the form and size of organized beings, must have been equally subject to many changes." Among all the animals of the primitive world, we discover not one that has not some relation to races known to us. The *Pterodaktylos* or *Ornithocephalus* and the *Megatherium*, deviate most from all our present creation. The latter approaches in size the *Rhinoceros*, but combines the character of the *Armadillo* and the *Sloth*; this is the most striking appearance; the character of the *Sloth* predominates however. The *Pterodaktylos* belongs to the family of bats, with this difference, that his head terminates in a snout, like that of the crocodile. How very much animal forms are influenced by climate and other circumstances, but especially by the proximity of man, we find illustrated in Link's work, Vol. I. Sec. 5, from which much information may be gathered: The home of domesticated animals, and cultivated plants; also Blumenbach in *Contributions to Natural History*, Vol. I. p. 24; also a very interesting essay, entitled "Geological Whim," in the *Morgenblatt*, No. 204, 1833. Let us notice e. g. that the sheep near the Senegal, are long legged and without wool; in northern Africa, Arabia and Persia, they have a long tail, overgrown with fat; in Wallachia their horns are of spiral form, and those of Iceland have frequently more than one pair of horns, but no wool, &c.; whilst the Buffalo has fourteen ribs, the common ox has only thirteen. The wolf, the progenitor of the dog, has seven lumbar vertebrae, the dog only six. Degeneracy and variety, are most remarkable in dogs and hogs. It is generally understood, that the domesticated hog and the wild boar belong to the same family, and yet the construction of their skulls differs widely. Rengger's description of the domestic cat of Paraguay, compared to ours, is very interesting; he says: "How much the climate affects the greater or less development of animals, may be observed in our cat, which was, at the time of the conquest of Paraguay, there introduced. Three hundred years have scarcely elapsed, and we find a striking difference between the cat of Paraguay and that of Europe. The domestic cat in the interior of Paraguay, where, since its first introduction, no intercourse, or scarcely any, is likely to have taken place, with cats of later importation, is distin-

guished from the European, by its short, shining, thin, and closely-packed hair, which on the tail is shorter than on the body. It is at least *one-fourth* smaller than the other, has a small contracted body, and more delicate limbs." The changeability of plants, and fruits, is peculiarly striking, and depends upon the climate and the cultivation by man. There were, in the Count's garden at Pappenheim, five thousand different kinds of Tulips, and the Turks enumerate thirteen hundred and twenty-three varieties; yet the Tulip was introduced into Europe as late as the sixteenth century. How can any one dispute the possibility, *that the forming principle of nature may have changed its course*, if we perceive, even now, the change-producing effects upon organization, being compelled to admit of great revolutions in nature, in connexion with the Deluge; revolutions which perhaps continued long afterwards. (In addition to this, compare what will be said No. IV. on races of men.) We quote here, in affirmation, Blumenbach's language, from "Contributions to Natural History," Vol. I. p. 19, . . . "that the forming principle, in accordance with matter, perhaps differently modified by such a thorough revolution, may, in the production of new species, have been forced into a new direction, deviating more or less from its former course."

After all, it remains fixed, that we have to adopt an inundation, extending at least over Europe, Asia and America, (the mountains of Africa have not yet been explored) by which even the highest mountains, the Mt. Blanc, the Himalay and the Cordilleras, were covered with remains of antediluvian animals. And that they are partly the bones of animals that were, during the flood, buried in places where they had lived; the greater part, however, as incidentally remarked in another place, belonging to former generations, whose remains were disturbed by the flood, and carried off. In favor of the latter assumption, we may mention, that all bones of one animal are rarely found together, and that complete skeletons are very scarce; commonly bones of various kinds of animals, of ancient and new formation, are mingled together. Finding the earth, after that period, nevertheless inhabited by man and all kinds of land animals, there remains for us, either to believe that God, after that terrible catastrophe, re-instated by an act of renewed creation, the perished races of men and animals, or, that a number of men, and specimens of the now living animals were saved from the flood, to people the new continent. And how much must this latter view

gain in credibility, if, to the reasons given us by Natural sciences, we add the historical traditions which, we may say, among all nations of the earth, have preserved the remembrance of a universal flood. We know precisely the Indian tradition concerning the great flood, since Bopp's work: *The Deluge*, and three of the most important episodes of the *Mahabharata*, Berlin 1829. It is very striking how many points coincide exactly with the relation by Moses; and not less so the existing differences, the fruit of the adventurous character of that people. Equally well known are the Chaldaic tradition of Xisutros, and the Greek by Deukalion; also faint traces in the Chinese, by Mengdsu, as communicated by Klapproth, in the *Asia polyglotta*. We know that the Greeks were even acquainted with the story of the dove (Plutarch). But most remarkable is the conformity existing between the Asiatic traditions, and those of America. The history on this subject, related by the Mexican Clavigero, in his *Storia del Messico*, Vol. II. p. 6; IV. p. 16, and adopted by Stollberg, in his *History of the Church*, has been doubted, for mentioning, in the traditions among the inhabitants of Cuba, not only the dove, but also the raven; but its critical reliability has been restored, since Humboldt has given similar accounts of the traditions of South American nations. The belief that "during the time of the great waters, when their forefathers had to save themselves in canoes, from perishing by the flood, the rocks of Encamarata were washed by the waves of the ocean," is found, as Humboldt states, not only among the isolated Tamanakes, but is an essential part of a system of historical traditions, of which traces are to be met among nearly all tribes on the upper Orinoco. One man and one woman, say the Tamanakes, saved themselves upon a high mountain, and afterwards, having thrown the fruit of the Mauritia palm backwards over their heads, new men and women sprang up from the seeds of that fruit,\* (entirely the tradition of Deukalion and Pyrrha). Adding to these historical traditions, spread all over the globe, the reasons founded upon Natural History, even if they should prove to be weak, it is sufficient to remove all doubts as to the fact of a general flood, and the saving of a few beginners of the human family, setting aside all information given us by the Bible.

\* Humboldt's voyage in the Equinoctial regions of the New Continent. Vol. III. p. 416.



To those who dispute on grounds based upon Natural History, a general inundation, which wrought the destruction of what was then the world, and disturbed the tombs of the primitive world, there is but one stronghold remaining, or rather has since been called into existence. This has been done by Leopold v. Buch, by his hypothesis of upheavals,\* which has extended so far as to cause the assertion by many modern Geologists, that the greater number of mountain chains was raised above the level of the earth, long after the creation of the world, which would satisfactorily explain the presence of animal remains upon inaccessible heights. This hypothesis has already gained considerable ground, although opposed by voices of great weight.† We wish to offer but one historical doubt. It is conceded by nearly all, that man, although not found in our regions among the remains of the ancient world, has existed, in Asia at least, contemporaneously with those animals; to suppose the earth for centuries without its Chief and King, *man*, is really an insufferable thought! If such events happened, as those which elevated the southwest border of the desert Gobi, from its level to the height of Dewalagiri, 26340 feet, at a time when man was a spectator, why is it, that history, and excepting the tradition of the Atlantes, that traditions remain silent of *that and similar upheavals*, when all tell us of a *universal flood*, nay, of *repeated inundations*?

Keferstein, a highly respected Mineralogist, partly in his work, *Natural History of the Earth*, 1834, and partly in a very instructive and interesting article in the *Lit. Advertiser*, 1839, lately sets forth: that the hypothesis of a changed course of the forming element of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, having caused the destruction of many species of organized beings, by an extraordinary catastrophe, is very probable. In his treatise: *Contributions to the discussed question, how do the results of scientific Geology compare with the history of the creation of the world, in the Bible?* Also in a former larger work, we find the following results of

\* We notice that Silberschlag in his *Geogony* has frequently mentioned Volcanic elevations, of which he found many traces in the Mark Brandenburg.

† First Goethe; afterwards Schnbert, on the uniformity of the plan of construction of the earth, 1835, &c.; Raumer's larger *Nat. Hist.* I. p. 468; *Universal Geography*, 2d Ed. p. 482; *Conversat. Lexicon*, 8th Ed. and above all, the sound chem. treat. by Fuchs, on the *Theory of the earth*. *Münchener gelehr. Anz.* 1838, No. 26, &c.

his researches: 1. Man already inhabited the earth, when northern Europe produced Elephants, Rhinoceroses, Hyenas, Bears and other animals now extinct, the species of which are even foreign to the present creation. 2. That man was the contemporary of antediluvian animals, and peopled this earth before the Deluge and the Tertiary formations. 3. Since France produced palms, and Elephants lived in the most northern latitudes, those regions must have had a hot climate. The climate is influenced by many circumstances, but especially the position of the earth's axis; this must, therefore, have been altered. That the change of the former into the present Fauna and Flora, and the former climate to that of our day, has been sudden, many reasons may be adduced. 4. There must have been a period when the Volcanic agencies of the earth were very active, during which Basalt and Granite were lifted from their positions; the waters were at such a height, as to carry ice fields of immense blocks, from Scandinavia as far as Holland, and from Mt. Blanc to the distant valleys of the Jura mountains. After this, in the history of the world, momentary revolution, our present time with its relations of climate on which organism depends, commences; organized beings had now to distribute themselves differently, and the destruction of many genera and species can astonish no longer.

Meanwhile, more accurate zoological researches have led the Christian men, among Naturalists, to the opinion that we should draw a specific line of distinction between the gigantic formations of the primitive world, and those of the present time; that they belong to a period of time when the king of all animals, man, had not yet appeared among his subjects. We mention Schubert as the representative of this view, in his treatise: *The plan of construction of this earth*; and later, in a recent edition of his large work on *Natural History*, I. p. 409, with whom Andreas Wagner, Professor of Zoology at Munich, agrees, in his interesting announcement of Buckland's *Geology* in the "*Münchener gelehrten Anzeigen* 1837, Nos. 48—53. To avoid prolixity, we extract from Schubert only that portion, in which he expressed his views on this subject very briefly. (The plan of construction of this earth)

He says, p. 18: "But how? perhaps the Granite of the Alps, and the layers of Belemnites, nay, the fishes and turtles of the Oolites, the Gypsum, and perhaps even the Tertiary mountains, all formed at the same time? Who can speak

of their cotemporary existence with the latter strata before him, in the successive formation of which, time has been engaged for thousands of years, and still continues, as it operates since centuries, upon the dome of the Cathedral of Milan? What successions of Aeones of the earth may have perished, before *from*, and *after* the destroyed forms of Tribolites and Orthoceratites, as well as from a former lost creation, a new creation of forms developed itself, which by degrees became more like the living species of animals, and lastly the latest, which are nearly or fully connected with the present? Those organic formations in the innermost depth of the earth, the Tribolites and Orthoceratites; with them, the Ammonites and the Belemnites, and thousands of other kinds of organic forms, bedded in strata of rock, are certainly of a creation of beings which has ceased to propagate itself. They are so at least in the same sense, as thousands of flowers, which cover the fruit trees in the spring of the year, and of which the greater number falls to the ground in a few weeks, without producing fruit, appear like a fruitless, perished world of things. They are so in the same sense in which the millions of living beings, in a fermenting drop of water, observable only through a powerful microscope, become a dying, raceless generation of animals, as soon as a living, healthy plant drinks up, by means of its roots, the thickly peopled drop, and mixes it with its sap. The grain of seed corn develops in the moistened soil the shooting germ, and at the same time, the albumen is decomposed and disappears, without any longer living or growing with the other remaining parts. The bridge, over which it was possible to retreat, is now broken down; a bold attack on an established opinion, in this field, is to be made. First we look around to discover a well armed ally. Ignaz Dollinger, the clearsighted, thoughtful Anatomist and Physiologist, whose eye is as well prepared for observations of this kind, as any man's, has in a peculiar kind of observations, first, to my knowledge, made the assertion in his little book on Fossils in siliceous sandstone,\* that the Entozoons of the earth, those organic forms, now petrefactions, surrounded by the depth of mountains, may have been beings of a different order and construction than those in exterior appearance similar organisms, living in the light of day, which, through an act of reproduction, increase and preserve themselves. Even the present condition of things

† Palm, Erlangen 1802.

has to show many organic formations, the origin and imperfect life of which, relate only to other more perfect beings, and which tracelessly disappear, as soon as these more perfect, for which alone they were created, can exist without them. When the living mammalia are born, what becomes of the placenta? When, from the body of the caterpillar, the butterfly is gradually developed, where remain so many organs, necessary and important to the life of the larva, but no longer of any use to the winged insect? If that disposition is lost, which, in a larger animal body, is favorable to the production of Entozoons, and in a drop of water, to the increase of Infusoria, what becomes of the animal links between? We think, a confirmation of the view, that a great portion of those beings which we know as petrefactions only, have been transitory appearances of the morning of creation, may be found, by an unprejudiced mind, in the condition in which we ordinarily discover organic formations, in the interior of mountains. A large number we find only in a certain region of mountain development, and nowhere else. Some of them wholly, others half formed, they often lie together in rows, like beings that are neither subject to the ordinary way of production, nor affected by animal putrefaction and decomposition. These beings were in reality neither old nor young; they transferred the form of their existence not any more upon a succeeding generation, than those petals of flowers ripen into fruit, which at the opening of the bud, fall to the ground. They are remaining witnesses of a moment in creation, when in the innermost depths of the still fluid, forming body of the earth, life was in motion, which became extinct again with the solidification of the strata.\*

As to Schubert's expression, *Nat. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 487, where he calls the productions of the primitive world "the intermediate productions of a creating power, which, by each pulsation of its motion, spread an abundance of manifold life upon

Wagner remarks in the above named criticism: "To justify this view is not without difficulty. Modern Geognosy, as is well known, characterizes formations, more from the enclosed petrefactions than from its mineral compounds. Particular strata of a formation are frequently named after its characteristic kind of petrefactions. What else is meant by this, than that the condition of a rock stands in genetic relation to the nature of its organic forms, so that the one is

\* For farther explanation, Vol. I. *Hist. of Nat.* § 26, p. 409.

dependent upon the mutability of the other. We must therefore, not look upon the lodgement of organic creatures in rocks, as if they had been present originally in the primitive ocean, and had been later, during the precipitation of masses of earth, accidentally enclosed; such a view would leave unexplained, why certain classes of animals are attached to certain strata, always present where these are found, always absent where these do not appear.\* If organic forms generally, had later been surrounded by precipitating strata, we cannot understand why they do not pervade a great number of successive strata, since they are not placed, like the layers of a bulbous root, surrounding the earth, and in this manner enabled to destroy one succession of organic developments after another; but, on the contrary, each geognostic formation is separated from another by intervals, in accordance with the individual character of mountains, in which spaces animals might have saved themselves, until perhaps overtaken by another precipitate. It is rather as follows: When the chaotic mass, set in motion by the creative power of life, began to separate, and a variety of formations commenced to appear, the foundation of the many geognostic formations shaped itself in gradual succession, from which a part of the enclosed germs of organic elements of life could not develop itself, whilst circumstances favored a development in others; so that at the same time, with the development *unorganic*, varied forms of *organic* formations originated, varying as often as the foundation itself, from which they had sprung, determining its nature and also influenced by it; just as the egg of the coral contributes partly to the formation of the earthy coral, and partly to the animal polypus. That these organic productions have not been preserved to our time, not even to the formation of the next strata, proves that they were identified with the peculiar condition of the waters from which they had sprung; this was also the cause of their geographical distribution by zones, as we now find them, conditioned however, by other influences, among living organizations. This order of things continued, however, only to the third day of creation, when the dry land separated from the waters, and perfected mountains made their appearance. Now, the earth vested itself in vegetation, which produced seed, and accordingly continued in substance to our own time."

\* When e. g. *ammonites nodosus*, *aviculites socialis*, are found, we may rely upon the proximity of calcined shells; in a like manner indicate *ammonites castatus*, pyritous limestone, and *ammonites planutatus*, Jura limestone.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Voice of Christian Life in Song: or, Hymns and Hymn-writers of many Lands and Ages.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530, Broadway.—1859.

This is truly a delightful book, the perusal of which has afforded us the highest enjoyment. Its theme is one in which we have ever taken the deepest interest. In his first chapter the author, speaking of church history, says: "We trace Christian life through its various manifestations of love, and find the golden chain unbroken through the ages, however dim at times the gold may shine. It manifests itself in its expansive form of love to man, in countless works of mercy, in missions, and hospitals, and ransomings of captives, and individual acts of love and self-sacrifice which cannot be numbered. We trace it in its direct manifestation of love to God, in martyrdoms and in hymns; the yielding up of the life to death for truth, and the breathing out of the soul to God in song.

The object of these pages is to follow the last track, by listening to the voice of that stream of spiritual song which has never been altogether silent on earth; by attempting to reproduce some notes of the song, and some likeness of the singers."

In performing the task thus assumed, the author treats of the following subjects: Chap. I. Hymns of the Bible. II. The "Tersanctus," the "Gloria in Excelsis," and the "Te Deum." III. The anonymous Greek Hymns. IV. Clement of Alexandria, Ephraem Syrus, and Gregory of Nazianzum. V. St. Ambrose and the Ambrosian Hymns. VI. Gregory the Great, Venantius Fortunatus, and the Venerable Bede. VII. St. Bernard. VIII. Mediaeval Hymns. IX. Mediaeval Religion. X. The Hymns of Germany. XI. Swedish Hymns. XII. English Hymns. XIII. Hymns of the Church of Rome since the Reformation. XIV. Conclusion. We can assure our readers that this is no dry exhibition, no mere scientific discussion, of the general subject of hymnology. The author's spirit is in lively sympathy, his heart beats in warm unison with those spirits and hearts out of which that stream of sacred song welled forth, which has edified and gladdened the church: he appears to be himself deeply imbued with that ardent love to God, that fervent devotion, that living faith, that spirit of trustful submission to the divine will, dispensations and guidance, which have, in all ages of the church, found fittest expression in the sweet or lofty strains of sacred song: in those

divine hymns, of which he truly says: "the battle-songs of the church are written on the battle-field; her poets are singers because they are believers." From the depths of genuine knowledge and of a true christian experience he gives us here, out of the abundance of his heart, vivid historical pictures, instructive dissertations and most edifying reflections on the hymns of the church produced in many lands and ages. There is in his train of thought and in his language a most winning charm; a fascination that carries you along, at times, as in a dream of the other and better land. He is evidently himself a poet; for every page affords evidence of genuine inspiration. He appears to be a clergyman of the Church of England, but he treats his theme in the most catholic spirit. In his chapter on the Hymns of Germany Luther is, of course, the prominent figure. At the close of the chapter he gives translations of six hymns, of which one is by Luther, one by the Electress Henrietta Louisa of Brandenburg, three by Paul Gerhard, and one by Count Zinzendorf. As this portion of the volume is more particularly interesting to our readers, we shall here quote some passages from it, both as specimens of the author's style, and of the character and tone of his treatise, and as evidences of his generally correct and just appreciation of Luther, and of those who, after him, tuned in our fathers' land the sacred lyre. "No mere improvement in correctness of doctrine could have stirred the heart of Europe as the Reformation did. The assertion of the 'right of private judgment' might have shattered Christendom with a war of independence, but could not have brought peace to one heart. Had not the serpent asserted it long ago in Eden? The clearest statements of the doctrine of justification by faith, could not in themselves have swept away all the barriers superstition had been building up for centuries between man and God. Many of the theologians of the middle ages seem to have understood that doctrine. The Reformation was not the mere statement of a positive dogma, still less was it the mere assertion of a negative right; it was the revealing of a Person, it was the unvailing of a heart. It was the fresh revelation through the Bible to the heart of one man, and through him to the hearts of thousands, that 'God is love,' and 'hath so loved the world,' that a heart of infinite love embraces us on every side, and rules in heaven. It was the fresh declaration to sinful men that the terrible reality of sin, which forms the barrier between the sinner and the Holy One, has been swept away by the sacrifice God himself has provided; not the offering of man, but 'the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world,' the Son of God who reveals the Father.

Before this gospel all the systems of human priesthood, and saintly intercession, indulgences, meritorious self-torture, fell in pieces, not like a fortress painfully battered down, but like dreams when daylight comes, like a misunderstanding between friends who have been slandered to one



another, in a moment's interview. Purchased indulgences to defend us from the anger of a Father; men, strangers to us, to intercede with him who beseeches us to be reconciled; painful penances to wring forgiveness of sins from him who died that we might be justly forgiven; all these fade into nothingness before that wondrous message of love.

One perusal of Luther's 'Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians,' with all its exaggerations and passionate vehemence, may give us a more true and living idea of what the Reformation was, than libraries of histories of its causes and disquisitions about its effects." Here follow several pages of translations of extended and very striking passages from the commentary on the Galatians. The author then proceeds:

"These extracts are given thus at length as unfolding the Reformation. Such books have the essence of a life pressed into them, and it was from such a fountain that the rich streams of German hymns flowed. It was morning again in Germany, and, to welcome such a morning, it was no wonder that there poured forth such a chorus of song.

The hymn literature of Germany is too rich to be given an idea of in the fragment of a book, and many admirable translations have already appeared, to which the reader may easily refer. There is, besides, a peculiar freshness and purity, an unconscious power and sublimity in these hymns, which make their translation peculiarly difficult. Simplicity in a translation is apt to look conscious, and so to become that worst of affectations, the affectation of simplicity. A very few illustrations, therefore, must suffice for this volume, with a brief sketch of the general character of the hymns and their writers.

In comparing these with those of the middle ages, the first thing that strikes us is the far greater variety in the subjects of the hymns and the position of the writers. Sacred song has issued again from the narrow walls of the cloister to the workshop, the harvest-field, and the home. There are hymns for various family joys and family sorrows, hymns for toil and for battle, for the sick-bed and the wayside.

Especially numerous are those which express trust in God in trial or conflict, which speak of Him, like the old Hebrew psalms, as a Rock, a Fortress, and a Deliverer. Spiritual songs have once more become battle-songs. The intricate intertwinings of rhyme and the lingering cadences of the later mediaeval hymns vanish, and the inspiring decision of martial music rings through them once more. They are songs to march to, reviving the fainting strength after many an hour of weary journeying; blasts of the priests' trumpets, before which many a stronghold has fallen; chants of trust and of triumph, which must often have reverberated from the very gates of heaven, as they accompanied the departing spirit thither, and mingled with the new song of the great multitude inside.

The hymns of Germany have been her true national Liturgy. In England the worship of the Reformed Church was linked to that of past ages by the prayer-book; in Germany by the hymn-book. The music and the hymns of the mediæval church were not separated by so definite a barrier from the psalmody of the German Evangelical Churches as from ours, but floated on into it, the old blending with the new. The miner's son, who in his school-days had carolled for bread before the doors of the burghers of Eisenach, remembered the old melodies when the hearts of his people were looking to him for the 'bread which satisfieth,' and gave forth out of his treasure-house things new and old. The great Reformer of the German church was also her first great singer. Luther gave the German people their hymn-book as well as their Bible. He brought over some of the best old hymns into the new worship, not word by word in the ferry-boat of a literal translation, but entire and living, like Israel through the Jordan, when the priests' feet, bearing the ark, swept back the waters.

Yet, as in his theses affixed to the church doors at Wittenberg, so in his hymns, Luther seems to have had no plan of writing for a nation, but simply to have spoken out the irrepressible emotions and overpowering convictions of his own heart, come of it what might. 'Here stand I, I can no other; God help me, Amen,' breathes through his hymns as well as his confession. The great battle-song of the German church, his 'Ein feste Burg,' was said to have come into his heart on his way to the Diet at Worms. Its truths were certainly there then, whatever antiquarian research may prove about the date when they were written down. 'Out of the depths I cry to thee,' he sang when recovering from a fainting fit, brought on by the intensity of spiritual conflict; and when at last his dead body was borne through Halle, on its way to its last resting-place at Wittenberg, his countrymen thronged into the church where it was laid, and, amidst their tears and sobs, sung the hymn beside it. His sweet Christmas hymn, 'Vom Himmel hoch da Komm ich her,' was written for his little son Hans. 'The poet had the child's heart in his breast.' From the old Latin psalmody he gave a free rhymed translation of the 'Te Deum' and several of the Ambrosian hymns. The funeral hymn, 'Media in vita in morte sumus,' composed by Notker, a monk of St. Gall, A. D. 900, he poured forth anew in three verses, and infused into it a tone of confidence and hope very faintly audible in the original.

Just as the first recorded hymn of the church was called forth by the first persecution, when the place was shaken where the disciples were met, and they were all 'filled with the Holy Ghost,' it is interesting to find that Luther's first hymn was called forth by the death of two martyrs of Christ, 'burnt at Brussels by the Sophists.'

To give a series of biographies of German hymn-writers, would be to write the church history of Germany. To the three thousand and sixty-

six hymns selected in the 'Liederschatz' of Albert Knapp is appended a list of four hundred writers, with brief biographical notices of each. It is this multiplicity of hymn-writers which, in regarding hymns as the voice of christian life, gives its great interest to German hymnology. The German hymn-book is no mere series of metrical compositions, compiled by a few orthodox divines; nor is it a collection of the religious poems of a few poets. It is the utterance of the heart of the German church, of those whom faith in Him who is invisible has made singers. It is emphatically a fragment of the great song of the church universal. For the first time in the history of hymns, since Mary the mother of Jesus sang her song of joy, the names of women appear among the singers. Louisa Henrietta, born princess of Orange, wife of the great Elector, Frederick William of Brandenburg, poured out her hope and trust in a Resurrection Hymn,\* which, as a rock of faith, stands beside the hymns of Luther himself, or Paul Gerhard. During the two hundred years which have elapsed since the Christian princess breathed her heart into those verses, how many souls have been breathed out to God with its words falling from the dying lips! A translation is attempted in this volume." p. 220 sqq. This is not a large work—a 12mo volume of a few over three hundred pages. We hope that we have said enough to induce very many of our readers to purchase it, confident that they will thank us for having directed their attention to it, and that we risk nothing in saying, that they will find it one of the most delightful volumes they have ever perused.

*The Sheepfold and the Common; or the Evangelical Rambler.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway.—1859.

This book is altogether *sui generis*. It is a reprint of a work originally published, above thirty years ago, under the title of the *Evangelical Rambler*. It had then an immense sale both in England and in America, and as it was thought by a large number of persons, that it might now prove as acceptable and useful as it did then, this new and *thoroughly revised* edition has been issued, under the title of "*The Sheepfold and the Common*," as being more descriptive of the aim and intention of the work than its former name. "The object of the work is to afford instruction and amusement, conveyed by a simple narration of the events of every-day life. In constructing his story, the author has availed himself occasionally of the conceptions of his fancy, and at other times he has crowded into a narrow compass facts and incidents culled from an extended period of his history; but reality forms the basis of every narrative and of every scene he has described. He has departed

\* Jesus meine Zuversicht.

from the common-place habit of presenting the grand truths of the christian faith in didactic and dogmatic statements, preferring the dramatic form, as more likely to arrest the attention and interest the feelings, especially of the youthful and imaginative portion of the community." Its primary design appears to be, to vindicate the character and claims of genuine evangelical and experimental religion, in opposition to the bigotry, the indifferentism, and the self-complacent but barren formalism which so long pervaded and, in some degree, still characterizes the church of England, and to the arrogant dogmatism and impertinent exclusivism of her modern Tractarians. Every subject is presented in the form of conversations between a great variety of persons, yet so as that there is a continuity and connectedness in the whole. The manner in which the nature and evangelical genuineness of true, practical, heart-religion are exhibited, illustrated and commended is exceedingly attractive, interesting, striking and impressive. In the progress of the narrative, which recounts the experiences, conversations, and reflections of an English clergyman of the Evangelical party, travelling from place to place in his native country, and presents a great number of scenes, situations and relations of the highest interest, a great variety of most important subjects come up for discussion. Scepticism and infidelity, under divers aspects, are encountered and discomfited with great ingenuity and acuteness: the church-of-England notion of Baptismal Regeneration, totally different from the much misunderstood and misrepresented doctrine of our own confession, and essentially Romanizing in its character, is severely handled, and justly so: spiritual ignorance, indifferentism, self-righteousness, and obduracy in sin are most searchingly and effectively dealt with: the absurdity of the vaunted apostolical succession is successfully demonstrated, and its impudent claims given up to well merited contempt: christian doctrine, life, duty, practice, consistency and example—the christian's strength and joy in earth's experiences and multiplied relations, his triumph in its struggles, temptations and conflicts, his victory and rejoicing in the hour of death, all are here presented with singular clearness, simplicity and force, and with an amplitude, beauty and aptness of illustration, which invest every subject in detail, and the whole great theme of religion, with a profound and absorbing interest. We most cordially recommend this very handsome octavo volume, as abounding in the most valuable instruction, presented in a truly popular form and pleasing style, and enforced with great earnestness and power of application.

Other book notices have been deferred for want of room.